Library of

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY

BRIGHTON, MASSACHUSETTS

LIBRARY
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
BRIGHTON, MASS.

THE

UNITED STATES CATHOLIC MAGAZINE AND MONTHLY REVIEW.

AUGUST, 1845.

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF SATISFACTION.

LETTERS TO N. WISEMAN, D. D., *on the Errors of Romanism, &c.* By the Rev. William Palmer, M. A., of Worcester College, Oxford. Baltimore: Joseph Robinson, 1843. Letters II, III, and IV. *On the foundation of the doctrine of Satisfaction, Indulgences, &c.; and on Satisfactions or Penances.*

PERHAPS the most beautiful feature in the Catholic religion, and, at the same time, one of the most striking evidences of its divine origin, is the wonderful harmony which pervades its entire system of faith, worship, and morals. One doctrine naturally leads to another, and this again to a third, and the whole series of principles forms one unbroken chain of truth, which reaches from earth to heaven, and binds man strongly to his God. Take but one link from that chain, and you break the connection, and destroy the integrity and usefulness of the chain itself. Add but one link to it, and you uselessly cumber its divine simplicity, and you greatly diminish its heavenly beauty, if you do not wholly mar its lofty purpose.

Whoever has studied well the philosophy of the Catholic system, and sounded its inmost depths, must have been forcibly struck by the intimate connection of its various parts, and the singular adaptation of the whole to the great purposes of the Christian religion—the purification and regeneration of fallen human nature, the restoration in the human soul of the partially defaced image of God, and the leading of man to his Creator. To these sublime ends every thing in Catholicity directly tends. Its doctrines enlighten the understanding, dispelling its clouds, and unfolding to it both the origin and the remedy of sin. Its moral principles guide the will and control the emotions of the heart; while its sacraments are the divinely appointed channels of grace, through which flow, in a perennial stream, the abundant waters of life eternal, "for the healing of the nations." No want of humanity is left unprovided for, no ill is left without its proper remedy, in this wonderful economy of grace.

Man, created originally to the image and likeness of his God, and constituted in a state of innocence and sanctification, became, by his fall, a victim of cruel wounds and of deeply seated hereditary infirmities both of soul and body. Christ came to restore him to the high estate from which he had fallen, and to heal his multiplied and aggravated and inveterate spiritual maladies. For this purpose he established his religion, which was thus essentially

medicinal, both in its character and in its object. It presented a balm for every disease, a panacea for every malady. The blessed Saviour represented himself as a heavenly physician divinely sent to heal the sick: "they that are in health need not a physician, but they that are sick." *

The Catholic religion professes, in an eminent degree, these distinctive characteristics of primitive Christianity. All its institutions are eminently *healing* in their nature and influence. They are founded on so deep a knowledge of human nature; they manifest so clear an insight into the hidden labyrinths of the human heart; they are so unearthly in their nature, so clearly supernatural in their means of action, so far remote from the senses, and so completely at war with the darling passions of fallen man: and, withal, they harmonize together so admirably in all their parts, that man could not, by possibility, have devised such a system;—it is clearly the work of God! In viewing the sublime character and the beautiful blending together of the various parts composing it, we exclaim with the royal psalmist: "the judgments of the Lord are true, *justified in themselves*." † This heavenly system flatters not the pride of man, it panders to no passion of corrupt human nature:—it declares war against all that is perverse, and bows down "every height that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God." ‡

A striking illustration of this divine harmony and admirable adaptation of the Catholic system is presented in its doctrine of SATISFACTION. This doctrine, besides being the basis of many other Catholic tenets and observances, flows itself directly from the great and cardinal doctrine of the ATONEMENT. It is but a carrying out, an application, and a perpetual embodiment of this great mystery of redemption; it is but a constant preaching of "Christ and of him crucified." It is the *spirit* of the great sacrifice of Calvary still lingering upon earth in the bosom of Christ's cherished disciples;—a spirit, however, not inert or disembodied, but vigorous and displaying itself by constant external acts of heroic self-denial and mortification. The CROSS! the CROSS of Jesus! How many saving truths, how many soul-stirring remembrances, how many thrilling associations, cluster around the cross!

To take an enlarged and adequate view of Christianity, we must stand at the foot of the cross with the blessed Mother of the crucified, and look abroad from the lofty eminence of Calvary. A new and brilliant prospect will then open before us; and new light will then burst upon our eyes. Then will we be able to view the Christian system in all its length and breadth, in all the wondrous harmony of its parts, and in all its divine adaptation to the wants of man.

Then will we see and *feel* that the atonement is the great centre of the Christian system, even as the sun is the centre of the universe; and that all the other doctrines of Christianity revolve around this centre, even as the planets revolve around the sun. And that, as in the material, so also in the spiritual universe of God, the sun of the system is the living Source of light and heat and life. Blot the material sun from the heavens, and how dark and cheerless and lifeless this world of ours would become! All the laws of nature would be arrested in their course; the heavens would no longer send down their dews and rains, the brooks and rivers would cease to flow, vegetation would wither and die, animal life would become extinct, and nature would return to its original chaos. So also, strike out the atonement from the Christian system, and human nature would again become, what it was before the coming of Christ, a dreary, dark, and frightful waste: the dews and rains of divine mercy would cease to distil from the heavens, the streams of grace would be dried up, no fragrant flowers and no luscious fruits of virtue would adorn and enrich the garden of the soul, all spiritual life would be extinguished, and man would descend from his lofty preeminence to a level with the mere animal creation.

But with the blessed doctrine of the atonement, all is light and warmth and life. Men no longer sit "in the region of the shadow of death," but they bask in the genial sunshine of heaven. Earth is no longer severed from heaven, but the two have become one; extremes have met; justice and mercy have embraced. By the saving influence of the atonement man has been reconciled to his God, and "the hand-writing of the decree which was

* St. Matth. ix, 12. † Psalm xviii, 10.
‡ 2 Corinth. x, 5.

against him has been taken out of the way and fastened to the cross."* By the precious blood which flowed from the wounds of Jesus Christ crucified, has salvation been purchased for all; and "through him God has reconciled all things unto himself, making peace *through the blood of his cross*, both as to the things that are on earth, and the things that are in heaven." † For we "have not been redeemed with corruptible gold and silver;..... but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb unspotted and undefiled." ‡

The pages of the New Testament are filled with similar passages, all proving that the blood of Christ shed on the cross is the great and *only* source and fountain-head of redemption, and of the lights, graces, and aids by which salvation can be obtained. "Nor is there salvation in any other. For there is no other name under heaven given to men, whereby we must be saved." § No prayer will be heard which is not uttered in the name of the Crucified; no grace can be obtained which is not asked for through the blood of the cross. Every grace which ever was, or ever will be bestowed upon mankind, from the date of the fall to the end of the world, was or will be bestowed *solely* in consequence of the blood of the cross, either actually shed or to be shed. There is nothing more certain than this: the whole scheme of salvation, whether in its germ under the old law, or in its full development under the new, rests upon this great cardinal truth. Thus the atonement operated both retrospectively and prospectively, and in point of time, as well as in vital importance, it is the great centre of the spiritual world.

The atonement was amply *sufficient* for all the wants of fallen human nature. In the prophetic language of the psalmist, it contained "an abundant redemption." ‖ It fully atoned not only for original sin, but also for *all* the actual sins of *all* mankind. Even one drop of the great Man-God's precious blood would have superabundantly sufficed to expiate the sins of ten thousand worlds; because it was of infinite value and acceptance with God. The one great sacrifice of the cross "obtained an eternal redemption," and "exhausted the sins of many." ¶ It fully paid the price of ransom for the sins of all the descendants of Adam. None were excepted from its influence, for "there is no exception of persons with God." All who had sinned in Adam, and had thereby incurred death, were ransomed in Christ.* The arms of the blessed Jesus extended on the cross embraced all mankind without exception: his heart loved all, and his heart's blood was bounteously poured out for all. And the system of belief which would limit the atonement to a select few is as unscriptural, as it is narrow, and unworthy of God.

By the atonement *ample* means were thus provided for the salvation of every child of Adam. Whoever is not saved, perishes by his own fault. God has fully and superabundantly done *his* part, and he may still address to the world the plaint erewhile uttered against the house of Israel: "what is there that I ought to do more to my vineyard that I have not done to it? Was it that I looked that it should bring forth grapes, and it hath brought forth wild grapes?" †

But man is free to use or to neglect these means of salvation; God offers no violence to his free will; he is still "placed in the hands of his counsel," ‡ and may choose either fire or water; either the fire of the divine indignation or the cooling streams of heavenly grace. God will compel none into heaven; he will bestow the crown of immortality only on those who have fought valiantly for it, and triumphed over sin through Jesus Christ.

As St. Augustine has somewhere remarked, God, who created us without our co-operation, will not save us without our co-operation. The abundant merits of the redemption will be applied to us *only* on condition that we, on our part, do all that God requires of us as preliminaries to the application; he kimself freely aiding and assisting us by his holy grace in these preliminaries. Of ourselves we can, indeed, do nothing towards our salvation; but without our free co-operation the grace of God will certainly not save us. Salvation is thus the result of two agencies combined: the weakness of man, strengthened and rendered efficient by the grace of God. The same inspired apostle who said, "we are not sufficient to think any thing of ourselves, as of our-

* Colossians ii, 14.
† Coloss. i, 20.
‡ 1 Ep. S. Peter i, 18, 19.
§ Acts iv, 12.
‖ Psalm cxxix, 7.
¶ Hebrews ix, 12 and 28.

* See Romans, ch. v.
† Isaiah v, 4.
‡ Ecclesiasticus xv, 14.

selves,"* also said, "I can do *all things* in him who strengtheneth me."†

With the blessed Saviour himself, the Catholic church has ever taught, that the merits of the atonement are applied only to those who strive earnestly, with the grace of God, to imitate Christ, in his spirit, in his life, and in his death. In the name of her divine head and spouse, she has ever addressed his words to all her children, as setting forth the essential conditions of discipleship: "if any man will come after me, let him *deny himself, take up his cross and follow me.*"‡ With the inspired Paul, she has ever taught that, to be sharers in the redemption, we must "be nailed to the cross with Christ; and live, now not we, but Christ in us."§ She tells us that "they who are Christ's *have crucified their flesh,* with the vices and concupiscences."‖ She tells us daily that, like St. Paul, we must "chastise our bodies and bring them into subjection,"¶ and must "*fill up those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ in our flesh.*"** She tells us, that we must "*do penance in sackcloth and ashes,*"†† as the Saviour said Tyre and Sidon would have done, had the works been performed in them that were done in Corozain and Bethsaida. She tells us what John told the Jews on the banks of the Jordan: "bring forth, therefore, *fruit worthy of penance;*‡‡ and what Christ said speaking of John: "the kingdom of heaven *suffereth violence, and the violent bear it away.*"§§ She tells us that those only are foreknown by God and predestinated to life eternal, who "*are made conformable to the image of his Son;*"‖‖ and that we must "*suffer* with Christ, if we would *reign* with him."¶¶

The whole New Testament abounds with such declarations, all going to show that we can not expect to share in the merits of the redemption, unless we do violence to ourselves, deny ourselves, mortify our members, imitate the example of Christ, and catch his expiatory and sacrificial spirit. He was innocence itself, and yet was he made a victim of sin; we are guilty, we contributed to nail him to the cross; we *deserve* to suffer. "The disciple is not above the master;" and, as St. Bernard well remarks, "it is not becoming that, under a head crowned with thorns, the members should be over delicate." No, no. Those deceive themselves, to their own eternal ruin, who think that they may be saved while reclining on a bed of roses, while Jesus entered into his glory by reclining on the bed of the cross. Those fatally deceive themselves, who think that they may reach heaven by treading the path of "primrose dalliance," while Jesus walked in a path bestrewed with thorns and marked by his own blood; and while *he* exclaimed: "how narrow is the gate, and straight is the way, which leadeth to life; and few there are who find it."*

All the saints of God, from the days of John the Baptist down to the present time—to say nothing of those who lived under the old law—have acted on these principles, and have walked in this narrow and thorny path; and, in doing so, they did but imitate the great SAINT of SAINTS, Jesus Christ himself, "the author and finisher of our faith." This doctrine it was which peopled the deserts with holy solitaries, who fled from the soft blandishments of the world and of the flesh, to crucify themselves in solitude. This doctrine it was which raised up whole armies of virgins and of holy celibataries, who, denying themselves and "crucifying their flesh with its vices and concupiscences," preserved to the end of life the lily of purity, and now are privileged in heaven to be the special favorites of the Lamb, and "to follow him whithersoever he goeth."† This doctrine it was which made the martyrs smile on death, and even sigh for death, that their blood might be mingled with that of the great expiatory sacrifice, and that they might die for Christ and *with* Christ. This doctrine, in fine, was the basis of the severe penitential discipline, which generally obtained in the ancient church, and which, though mitigated in rigor, still exists in the Catholic church of the present day.

Are we better than were the saints? Are we purer than was St. Paul? Can we expect to gain heaven by any easier way than that pressed and hallowed by the footsteps of all the special friends of God and of Christ in all ages past? Have we fewer or less grievous sins to expiate than they had? Have we less need of

*2 Corinth. iii, 4.
‡St. Matth. xvi, 24.
‖ Gallatians v, 24.
** Colossians i, 24.
‡‡St. Matth. iii, 8.
‖‖ Romans viii, 29.
†Philippians iv, 13.
§ Gallatians ii, 19, 20.
¶ 1 Corinthians ix, 27.
†† St. Matth. xi, 21 & Luke [x, 13.
§§ Id. xi, 12.
¶¶ 2 Timothy ii, 12.

*St. Matth. vii, 14. †Apocalypse xiv, 4.

penitential works? Have we less reason "to work out our salvation with fear and trembling,"* and "by good works to make sure our vocation and election?"† We deceive ourselves, if we think so. Had there been an easier way to heaven than that we have indicated above, Christ and his apostles would certainly have pointed it out to us by word or example, or by both.

In voluntarily entering upon and pursuing the painful way of the cross, the saints sought, not only to be conformable to the *outward* example of Jesus Christ, but to enter into his *spirit*, and to offer themselves up as victims and holocausts of sin *with* him. They presented "their members as instruments of *justice* to God;"‡ and they were ready to die with Christ in expiation of their own sins and of those of their brethren. Their sufferings and penitential works, they knew and *felt*, had no intrinsic efficacy whatever, apart from the merits of Christ, towards obtaining the remission of sin or an increase of sanctity; but united with the suffering, and hallowed by the spirit, of the Redeemer, they were rendered acceptable to heaven, and became powerful aids to salvation. The sacrifice of the disciple was acceptable *only* when united with the sacrifice of the Master. The Father loved those only who were conformable to the image of his well-beloved son.

This spirit of sacrifice, springing thus from the great sacrifice of the cross, is the source of those austerities, voluntary macerations, penances, fasting, bodily inflictions, and other satisfactions, which have ever been dear to the fervent members of the Catholic church. The cross pervades the whole Catholic system, and hallows its every observance. Sin nailed Jesus Christ to the cross; and the penance of a whole life-time should not be deemed too much atonement for one single sin. The Catholic is exhorted to preserve always an humble and penitential spirit, to be ever lowly in mind, and to tremble at the very shadow of sin, to cherish a constant spirit of compunction, and, in a word, to live and die with Christ on the cross. Penance is represented to him as the only safeguard of virtue, and the only sure means of salvation: "unless you do penance, you shall all likewise perish."§

This holy compunction is daily nourished and strengthened by the great sacrifice of the new law, itself but a continuation and application of the one mediatorial sacrifice of Calvary. In the mass, the same victim of expiation, who freely bled on the cross for the sins of all mankind, is daily offered up in an unbloody manner on the altar; and thus "the death of the Lord *is shown forth*, until he come."* The idea of the sacrifice is thus kept fresh in the minds of the faithful; and the one great sacrifice of the cross is no longer a mere matter of history—a mere *fact* that is past—but it is continually reproduced and made present again as a living and breathing reality. Far from impairing the value and efficacy of the sacrifice on the cross, the clean oblation of the altar leads the mind back continually to that bloody expiation, and brings the Catholic daily and hourly to the summi tof Calvary, where his devotion receives a new impulse, and his soul kindles with a new fervor. The sacrifice of the mass is an exhaustless fountain of mercy, containing the living waters which spring up unto everlasting life, at which the devoted hero of the cross may be constantly refreshed, and prepared to make new sacrifices for the love of Christ crucified. Those who can not see all this have never studied the Catholic doctrine in all its length and breadth and depth.

Thus every thing in the Catholic system is referred to the great doctrine of the atonement made once on the cross, as to its centre and principle. This principle imparts health and vigor and life to all the doctrines and observances of Catholicity; and these, in their turn, recognise and set it off. The Christian life, as developed in the Catholic church, is but an embodiment of the great atoning sacrifice—of its *spirit* as well as of its *outward* form. The Catholic is told to keep his eye continually on Mount Calvary, where his love was crucified—"to look, and make (his life) like the pattern that was shown him in the mount."† He is told that he can not hope for the pardon of his sins nor for everlasting life, unless he enter fully into the propitiatory and sacrificial spirit of Christ, and be prepared to be crucified with him in atonement for sin; for that the merits of the atonement will be applied to him on no other condition. To be saved, he must have not only faith, but works.

Such is a brief and imperfect outline of the

* Philip. ii, 14. † 2 Peter i, 10.
‡ Romans vi, 13. § St. Luke xiii, 3.

* 1 Corinth. xi, 26. † Exodus xxv, 40.

doctrine of the atonement considered as the basis of the Catholic doctrine of satisfaction. We think no impartial person can examine it thoroughly without pronouncing it, not only conformable to Scripture, but, also, entirely consistent with itself and an admirable carrying out of the great scheme of man's redemption.

The Protestant takes a different view altogether of the atonement. He agrees with the Catholic in admitting its entire sufficiency and efficacy for the reconciliation of the sinner and for the salvation of men; but he differs from the Catholic in regard to the manner in which its efficacy and merits are to be *applied* to the soul. The starting point of the Protestant is the great principle broached by Luther and his co-reformers—*that man is justified by faith* ALONE *without works.* The merits of the atonement "are apprehended by faith;" and if the sinner have only faith, he need fear nothing; he will be justified in this life, and saved in the next. Let him only believe firmly that Christ has died for him, and that his sins are pardoned by Christ, and, from a sinner, he becomes a saint! No works of penance or satisfaction are at all requisite; no fasting, no bodily inflictions, no mortification;—faith alone will suffice for every thing. Christ has undergone all the suffering; we need suffer nothing: he has fully expiated our sins; nothing expiatory remains for us to do! Nay, it would be a derogation from the all-sufficient atonement of Christ, were we to deem any thing but mere faith at all necessary for our justification! In a word, according to this system, Christ has done *every thing* in the way of satisfaction; he has left nothing for us to do except to believe!

Luther carried out this comfortable doctrine to its fullest extent; he even rejected good works as useless, if not positively sinful. With him, faith was every thing, works nothing. He boldly corrupted the word of God in order to make it speak a language conformable to this his favorite theory;* and he wholly rejected the Epistle of St. James, as "an epistle of straw and unworthy an apostle," because it contains the following passages† clearly condemnatory of his error.

"What shall it profit, my brethren, if a man say he hath faith, but hath not works? Shall faith be able to save him?"

"Even so faith, if it have not works, *is dead in itself.*"

"The devils also believe and tremble."

"For as the body without the spirit is dead, so also faith without works is dead," &c.

Modern Protestants, indeed, appear to have mitigated somewhat this original doctrine of the reformation; but they still retain the doctrine itself, and it still exercises a powerful influence over their entire system. They still maintain that we are justified by faith alone, though most of them require works as a sequel to faith, or as the necessary fruits of justifying faith. They all, however, concur in rejecting the obligation of works of penance and satisfaction; and in this they are but consistent with their great principle of justification by faith alone. But Luther was certainly more consistent than they; for he did not halt half way, but boldly carried out the principle to its fullest extent; while they appear to exclude only that class of works which is most painful to human nature.

It must be admitted that the Protestant is a very convenient and comfortable doctrine, which has made the path to heaven quite smooth and easy. If it be only *safe*, it is certainly a decided improvement on the good old Catholic method of mortification and penance. It has widened and smoothed the once narrow and rugged way of salvation; and a Christian may now go to heaven on a comfortable turnpike if not on a rail-road! Verily, ours is an age of improvement! We have greatly improved even on the example of St. Paul, of St. John the Baptist, and of Christ himself!! These, and all the saints of the olden time, led a hard and mortified life; but our modern preachers of the Gospel have changed all this!

We are doing our separated brethren no injustice. We are merely painting in a forcible manner the obvious tendency of their system, which many of them, we are happy to believe, do not fully carry out in practice. But is it not fashionable among Protestants to sneer at celibacy, at fasting, at penitential practices, at corporal inflictions and macerations? Are not all these practices often represented as a useless and foolish and even impious self-torment? Are not Catholics often likened to the Brahmin devotee of India, or to the fanatical worshippers

* In the text of St. Paul (Rom. iii, 28.) "For we account a man justified by faith," &c., Luther added *alone;* and when challenged on the subject he answered: Sic volo, sic jubeo, stat pro ratione voluntas! So I will, so I command, let my will stand for a reason.

† Ch. ii, vv. 14, 17, 19, 26.

of Juggernaut? Are not our saints ridiculed for having worn haircloths, used the discipline, practised chastity, renounced the world with all its dangerous blandishments, and retired into the wilderness in imitation of Elias, and of St. John the Baptist, and of Christ himself?

And whence this cavilling and bitterly sneering spirit, if not from the very principle to which we allude? What does Protestantism enjoin or recommend that is particularly painful to the senses? Does it not constantly flatter the pride of the human mind by setting forth the glorious privilege of private judgment in opposition to the authority of the church? Does it not place the married above the unmarried life, in direct opposition to St. Paul?* Does it breathe one syllable about mental prayer, about entire abstraction from the world, about mortification of our carnal appetites, about love of solitude? Has it *one* institution embodying these lofty principles? Has it produced one *saint* who reduced them to practice? If it has done any of these things, we apprehend the rest of the world has not known the fact.

In viewing the easy and comfortable doctrine of salvation devised and practised by our dissentient brethren, we are forcibly reminded of a withering passage from the pen of Tertullian, who thus rebuked, with a biting sarcasm peculiarly his own, the softness of some among his cotemporaries, more than sixteen hundred years ago.

"Is it proper for us to supplicate for pardon of our sins while clad in scarlet and purple? I allow you a brooch for adjusting your hair, powders for whitening your teeth, and an instrument of iron or brass for trimming your nails; I allow you to paint your lips and cheeks that they may shine forth with fictitious lustre; I entreat you to seek out more refreshing baths, and to cool yourselves in more shady gardens or maritime retreats; add to your expenses, seek out the fattest ox and feast on its dainty flesh, warm up your old age with generous wines;—and if any one ask you, why you bestow so many comforts on your soul? tell him, I have sinned against God, and am in danger of perishing eternally!!"†

There are, then, two different ways to heaven: the one ancient, the other modern; the one strewn with thorns, the other with roses; the one offering us pardon and heaven on condition of doing penance and practising good works in conjunction with faith, the other bidding us be of good cheer—for that faith alone will save us. Which of these ways is the *safer?* Which is more conformable to the passages of the inspired volume referred to above, and which more in accordance with the example set us by Jesus Christ, and by *all* the saints both of the old and of the new law? We think no one can be at a loss for an answer, and that every sensible man and sincere Christian would be disposed to respond, as Melancthon did to his dying mother who had asked his advice as to the religion she should embrace: "the Protestant way is the most *convenient*, the Catholic is the SAFER."

We do not mean to imply that all Catholics practise penitential austerities, and that all Protestants entirely neglect them. We are speaking of principles, not of men; of the nature and obvious tendency of the systems taught respectively by the Catholic and Protestant communions in regard to justification, not of the lives of those who profess to be governed by those systems. The Catholic may fall far short of his principles in daily practice, while the Protestant may go far beyond his:—and we have not a doubt that such is often the case in regard to both.

If we have dwelt thus long on general principles, it is because we deemed them of essential importance to the matter in hand—a refutation of the specious quibbles of Mr. Palmer in regard to the Catholic doctrine of satisfaction.

He does not go back to first principles at all; and though he devotes three lengthy letters to an examination of the Catholic doctrine on this and other kindred points, yet he does not say any thing in relation to the *real* basis upon which all these doctrines rest. And we deemed it absolutely necessary to supply this deficiency. The foundation of the Catholic doctrine of satisfaction, as well as that of the derivative or cognate doctrines of indulgences and purgatory, lies much deeper than the single principle which Mr. Palmer labors so strenu-

* See 1 Corinth. ch. vii. Read the whole chapter.

† "Num ergo in Coccino et Tyris pro delictis supplicare nos condecet? Cedo acum crinibus distinguendis, et pulverem dentibus elimandis, et bisulcum aliquid ferri vel æris unguibus repastinandis; siquid ficti nitoris, siquid coacti ruboris, in labia aut genas urgeat: præterea exquirito balneas lætiores, hortulani maritimive recessus; adjicito ad sumptum, conquirito altilium enormem saginam, defæcato senectutem vini; cum quis interrogarit, cur animæ largiaris; deliqui, dicito, in Deum, et periclitor in æternum perire." Tertullianus, Lib. de Pænitentia.

ously to refute, viz: that after the *guilt* of mortal sin and the *eternal* punishment due to it have been remitted by God, there sometimes* or often remains a *temporal* punishment due to the divine justice, which *temporal* punishment will be exacted either in this life or in the next in purgatory, unless it be remitted in view of the penitential works of the pardoned sinner, whether enjoined upon him or spontaneously undertaken, or of an indulgence granted by the church in the name of Christ or of both conjoined. This principle, indeed, is the *immediate and proximate* basis of the doctrine; but the cross of Jesus, and the obligation of imitating the example of Jesus crucified, and of entering into the *spirit* of his great atonement, constitute the more remote and deeper foundation of this and of all other Catholic doctrines. This, we trust, we have already shown, and Mr. Palmer has not even *attempted* to shake one of the great principles we have above laid down and endeavored to demonstrate.

And his attempt to disprove the principle just referred to, as the *immediate* basis of the doctrine of satisfaction, is one of the feeblest arguments we have ever chanced to read. It is as weak as it is pretending. It contains not one new idea, it presents not one new objection. A much stronger argument against the Catholic doctrine might have been produced by merely translating Bellarmine's objections without his replies! An intelligent Scotch gentleman once informed us that this trick, on a larger scale, was actually tried some years ago in Edinburg, and that the translation of *all* Bellarmine's objections against Catholic doctrines, *without his answers*, was deemed the strongest book against "popery" which had ever appeared!†

We venture the assertion that there is not *one* objection against the doctrine of satisfaction in all the three letters of Mr. Palmer which was not already alleged—and *better* alleged—and refuted too, by Bellarmine, nearly two hundred and fifty years ago! And we go even farther, and say that there is scarcely one of our most commonplace theologians who has not taken up and answered those identical arguments! So much for the learning and originality of Mr. Palmer, the boasted "no popery" champion of Oxford, the very impersonation of Anglican learning! Strip him of his borrowed plumage, and he would be bare indeed; take away his second-hand learning, and his works would become the mere shadow of their former selves! There is scarcely a tyro in Catholic theology who could not make out a stronger case against "popery," and refute it too.*

We are confident that we are doing the Oxford divine no injustice. We have surveyed the whole ground he has gone over, and we speak advisedly on the subject. Our narrow limits will not allow us to take up and answer, one by one, the objections he offers against the Catholic principle, "that a portion of *temporal* punishment sometimes or often remains due to the divine justice after the guilt and the *eternal* punishment of grievous sin have been remitted by God." But his principal and most specious arguments may be ranged under three heads, which we propose briefly to state, and to answer in succession.

* The Catholic doctrine, strictly speaking, only requires us to believe that *a portion* at least of the temporal punishment due to sin *sometimes* remains after the sin itself has been remitted; though our theologians usually employ the term *often* or *generally* instead of *sometimes*. Si quis dixerit *totam* pœnam simul cum culpa remitti *semper* a Deo, satisfactionemque pœnitentium non esse aliam quam fidem, qua apprehendunt Christum pro eis satisfecisse; anathema sit. (Canon xii, Sessio xiv, Concil. Trid.) The wording, however, of the fifteenth canon seems to justify the manner of speaking adopted by Catholic divines.

† The work was entitled *Bellarminus Orthodoxus*.

* Does Mr. Palmer really understand Latin, or does he find it *convenient* to mistranslate only when attacking "Romanism?" Are we to charge to his ignorance or to his prejudice his grievous mistranslation of canon xiii, session xiv of the council of Trent? He has made the fathers say just the contrary of what they really said; and that, too, in a doctrinal definition! We give the original with Mr. Palmer's translation, merely italicizing the mistranslated passage. From the fact that Mr. Palmer felt compelled to enclose this passage in a parenthesis, thereby cutting off its connection with what follows, we are strongly inclined to the opinion that he really did not understand the original Latin in which it was written.

Original Latin.	*Mr. Palmer's translation.*
Si quis dixerit pro peccatis, quoad pœnam temporalem, minime Deo per Christi merita satisfieri pœnis ab eo inflictis et patienter toleratis, vel a sacerdote injunctis, *sed neque sponte susceptis*, et jejuniis, orationibus, eleemosynis, vel aliis etiam pietatis operibus, atque ideo optimam pœnitentiam esse tantum novam vitam; anathema sit.—Canon xiii, sessio xiv.	If any one saith that no satisfaction is made to God for sins, as to their temporal punishment, through the merits of Christ, by punishments inflicted by him (God) and patiently endured, or enjoined by the priest, or *even spontaneously undertaken*, such as fasting, prayer, almsgiving, or other works of piety; and therefore that the best penance is only a new life; let him be anathema.—Letter ii, p. 7.

1. The first class of objections consists of an attempt to refute the scriptural arguments alleged by our divines in support of the Catholic principle.*

The holy Scriptures abound with examples of a temporal punishment exacted by God, even from his most favored servants, *after* their sins had been already divinely declared to be forgiven. The whole human race is, in fact, a striking example of this feature in the divine economy. Sickness, all the ills of life, and death itself, what are they but the wages of that first sin, by which our first parents disobeyed the command of God in the garden of paradise? And yet is there no doubt whatever that that first sin was pardoned, in view of the long and rigorous penance of our protoparents. Thus a vast accumulation of *temporal* punishments has been for centuries, and is yet, exacted by God, for a sin pardoned thousands of years ago! And no matter how perfect or holy may be the descendant of Adam; no matter how thoroughly he may have been purified in the blood of the Lamb, yet is he still subject to sickness, to numberless infirmities, to death! So unbending is this law of the divine justice, that even the great SAINT of SAINTS, the immaculate Son of God, was not exempt from its influence, when he clothed himself with man's nature, and became man's Sponsor to his Father! Jesus suffered, Jesus died, in the midst of agony unspeakable, in consequence of the fall of Adam, and of the accumulated guilt of his tainted descendants! And though he expiated the fault by his death on the cross, yet is the temporal penalty still sternly exacted *to this very day*, and it will be exacted to the end of time!

This one great leading fact would suffice of itself to establish the Catholic principle. How does Mr. Palmer answer this argument? He meets it with the paltry quibble, that these temporal punishments are the award of *original* and not of *actual* sin, and that, therefore, they prove nothing! † But is not the principle clearly the same in regard to both species of sin? Does Mr. Palmer even *attempt* to show that there is no parallelism, as far as the present argument is concerned? He does not. He seems to think that assertion may be substituted for sound argument in the warfare against Rome. Was not Adam's sin an *actual* sin? And was not *he* punished with *temporal* penalties even after this *actual* sin had been pardoned? Mr. Palmer admits this,* but very acutely observes that God was under a promise to punish Adam temporally, and that "consequently (!) the punishment of Adam proves nothing!!" O tempora! He really ought to write a book on logic! Does it weaken the argument that the temporal punishment awarded to Adam and Eve was extended to all their posterity to the end of time, Christ himself not excepted?

But we have many special examples of this same principle, recorded on the pages of the inspired volume, in addition to the numerous scriptural passages alleged in the first part of this paper, which likewise clearly establish its truth.

Thus, Moses and Aaron distrusted the word of God at "the waters of contradiction," and though their sin was, no doubt, pardoned, yet did God sternly exact the heavy *temporal* penalty of their dying in sight of the promised land without being allowed to enter it. And he assigned, as a reason for this punishment, the sin of incredulity they had committed at "the waters of contradiction;"† thereby clearly intimating that his *justice* required the penalty.

So, also, when the Israelites worshipped the golden calf in the wilderness, the wrath of God was enkindled against them, and he threatened to destroy them all, but at the prayer of Moses, "the Lord was appeased;" yet did his justice still exact a grievous *temporal* punishment, and "there were slain that day about *three and twenty thousand men!*" ‡

Again, when the people of Israel murmured against God in the desert, his anger was on the point of consuming them all, but Moses earnestly interposed in their behalf, and the Lord said, "I have *forgiven* according to thy word;" yet he immediately added the stern claim of his *justice* to an awful *temporal* chastisement for their crime: "but yet all the men that have seen my majesty, and the signs that I have done in Egypt, and in the wilderness, and have tempted me now ten times, and have not obeyed my voice, *shall not see the land* for which I swore to their fathers; . . . . . in the wilderness shall your carcasses lie; your chil-

* Letter ii, p. 14 seqq. † Ibid. pp. 18, 19.

* Ibid. p. 19, note. † Numbers xx, 12 and 24.
‡ Exodus xxxii, 10, 14, 28.

dren shall wander in the wilderness *forty years*, ... until the carcasses of their fathers be consumed in the desert."*

Who more holy or favored of God than David, the man "after God's own heart?" David sinned grievously; he repented sincerely, and the inspired prophet, Nathan, declared to him, "the Lord hath also *taken away* thy sin;" and yet this same divine messenger immediately added: "Nevertheless, because thou hast given occasion to the enemies of God to blaspheme, *for this thing* the child that is born to thee shall surely die."† And this severe *temporal* punishment, as well as a long train of other temporal evils, was rigorously exacted of the royal penitent, though his sin had already been pardoned! David bowed under the scourging hand of God, and patiently submitted to the penalties which he knew and *felt* that his sins deserved, though he had the positive assurance that they were already forgiven!

What clearer proofs of the Catholic doctrine could any one ask? Do not all these instances clearly establish the precise principle we are contending for? If not, we would wish to know what evidence would be required to establish that principle?

And how does Mr. Palmer answer all these facts and arguments? His answer is a simple repetition of what had been advanced and refuted a thousand times already! He gravely tells us that there is no parallelism between the circumstances of the people of God under the old, and the people of God under the new law.

"A temporal penalty of some sort," he observes, "was necessary when God *visibly* interfered in the affairs of men. But now that his guidance is entirely spiritual and invisible, temporal penalties are no longer necessary in the same way."‡

This means that under the old law such punishments were necessary for example and for warning to others, especially when the offender was a person of high standing and influence, and the offence was public and scandalous. But this is taking a very narrow view of the subject; it is assigning, as the *only* motive of the divine conduct, a reason, either not warranted by the facts at all, or plainly secondary and accidental to the real merits of the case. Whoever will examine the scriptural facts above alleged, must see that the temporal punishment was awarded for the *offence itself*, and with the clearly *expressed* intimation that the *justice* of God required its infliction; and all this *after* the sin itself had been pardoned. To say that it was awarded merely as a warning to others, or for the correction of the offender, is an assertion wholly gratuitous, and without a shadow of proof in the facts themselves. If we be permitted thus to explain away the plainest passages of Scripture, in order to make them bend to a preconceived theory, what certainty is there any longer in scriptural interpretation?

Mr. Palmer himself does not appear to rely much on this means of escaping from the difficulty; for we find him resorting to a new species of chicanery in order to parry the force of the argument drawn from God's conduct towards the Israelites, related in chapter xiv of Numbers, and in chapter xxxii of Exodus, referred to above. He gravely assures us that when God declared to Moses, "I have pardoned (*forgiven* in the Catholic version), according to thy word," "he did not imply the forgiveness of the *sin* committed, and the *justification* of those who had committed it," but merely "a remission of the immediate destruction by pestilence, and the disinheritance which God had threatened!"* Likewise, when the sacred writer informs us that "God was appeased," the expression only means that "he had commuted the sentence of utter destruction which he had pronounced against that people for their idolatry, into chastisements of a different character, at the prayer and intercession of Moses."†

We are willing to let these ingenious interpretations pass for what they are worth. They forcibly remind us of certain learned biblical exegesists in Germany, who have lately, by similar arts, frittered away the very substance of revelation; and we think Mr. Palmer might put in some claims to a connection with the school which they have founded. But we must hasten on to the second class of objections raised by him against the Catholic doctrine of satisfaction.

2. He enters into a course of what he, no doubt, deemed stringent reasoning, to prove

*Numbers xiv, 20, 22, 23, 32, 33.
†2 Kings (or Samuel) xii, 9, 13, 14.
‡Letter ii, p. 15.

*Ibid. pp. 16, 17. †Ibid.

that the Catholic doctrine is absurd, inconsistent with itself, and subversive of man's salvation.* He can not conceive how God can remit the sin itself, and the eternal punishment due to it, and still reserve to himself the right of exacting a temporal penalty from the hands of the pardoned sinner. *He* can not understand it, therefore it is absurd! *He* can not fathom the counsels of God, therefore they are wholly unfathomable, if not absurd! This is reasoning backwards. It is precisely the process adopted by the Socinian to impugn the Trinity, and by the deist to disprove revelation.

Will Mr. Palmer explain how God could still leave *him* subject to disease, to concupiscence, and to death, notwithstanding the full pardon of all his sins, and of all the *eternal* punishments due to them—which we trust has been extended to him—and notwithstanding that the sin of Adam and Eve, which provoked all those temporal penalties, was also long since remitted by God? If he will explain this, and all the other facts of a precisely similar character alleged above, then may we undertake to explain to him how God may yet reserve a temporal penalty after the pardon of sin. The ways of God are not to be judged by our imperfect and low human standard; they are to be judged by the facts and principles which *he* has vouchsafed to reveal to us. And if there be any certainty in the Scriptures, the principle of divine action contended for by Catholics is, as we have seen, therein clearly set forth.

Mr. Palmer winds up his reasoning under this head with the following remarkable passage:

"So that, according to your doctrine, the justified and pardoned believer is still subject to God's wrath! The adopted, beloved, and sanctified child is still subject to God's vengeance! God loves and hates, saves and destroys, at the same moment; and the same beings are at once reckoned with the elect and the reprobate, with angels and with devils! Can it be possible for absurdity, contradiction, and impiety to go beyond this! And yet this is the necessary, the inevitable consequence to which your doctrine leads."*

Nonsense! The Catholic doctrine teaches no such absurdities, and leads to no such consequences; they exist only in Mr. Palmer's heated brain. Those whose sins God has forgiven, are not any longer, according to the Catholic doctrine, reckoned with "reprobates and devils;" they are not "hated or destroyed" by God. The justice of God may, indeed, still have some slight claims on them for past transgressions not yet fully atoned for, but he loves them, and has already washed them in the blood of his well-beloved Son. If he chastise them still, it is as a most tender parent chastises a well-beloved child. His apostle tells us, "whom the Lord loveth he chastiseth, and he scourgeth every son whom he receiveth."* Does this prove that his favorite children are, at the same time, "loved and hated, saved and destroyed?" In short, Mr. Palmer's argument applies with equal force to all the scriptural facts on the subject which we have already furnished.

Though we can not pretend to fathom the mind of God, and though it is not at all necessary to inquire into any thing farther than *facts* when it is question of divine agency, yet may we assign some plausible reasons, based on revelation, for the occasional or frequent reservation of a temporal penalty after the pardon of the sin itself. God's mercies are, indeed, above all his works, and the atonement of Christ is superabundant; but is it proper that a grievous sinner, who has long outraged God by his iniquities, and long trampled on the blood of the Lamb by which he was once washed from all defilement in baptism, should be *immediately* reinstated, not only in the divine favor, but also in all the privileges of a cherished child of God?† Should he not be required to do something to indicate the depth of his sorrow, and to atone somewhat, by and through the merits of Jesus Christ, for his former iniquities? Should he not chastise his body with St. Paul, crucify his flesh, make his members instruments of divine justice, as he had prostituted them to sin?‡ Should he not do as much for God as he had done against God, and punish himself at least as much as he had unlawfully gratified himself?

There is a voice in the human bosom which proclaims the fitness and the justice of this course; and he who thinks he shall escape "the wrath to come," without "bringing forth fruits worthy of penance," deceives himself fatally. Does not the wise man tell us: "Be

* Letter ii, pp. 21 et seqq.

* Ibid. p. 23.

* Hebrews xii, 6.

† See St. Paul's testimony, Hebrews vi, 4 seq.—an obscure but terrible passage.

‡ See Romans vi.

not without fear about sin forgiven?"* How can the sinner expect to share in the atonement of Christ, without entering into the atoning spirit of Christ, and without being willing to suffer and to die with Christ? *He* was innocent, and the sinner is guilty; and shall the innocent suffer all, and the guilty nothing? No! cold and dreary Protestantism! Thou pratest much about the atonement, and thou sneerest bitterly at others, but thou understandest not what the atonement is! Thou hast not one particle of the noble heroism inspired by the atonement!

There have been, and there are still, no doubt, many instances in which God has remitted or remits the *whole temporal* punishment along with the guilt of sin, moved to it by his own abounding mercy, and by the superior fervor of the penitent. The prodigal son, the thief on the cross, Magdalene, and others, are instances of this kind. But can all expect a like favor? As well might all the sick among Christians claim to be suddenly healed, as were those in the time of our Saviour, and all the dead, to be suddenly resuscitated, like Lazarus!

In the curative process, after the malady has been entirely healed, the effects of it are often sensibly felt during a longer or shorter convalescence; so also, in the process of spiritual healing, there may often remain some effects or remnants of the disease, after the malady itself has been removed by forgiveness. The same Lord is the God of nature as well as of grace, and he frequently adopts similar modes of procedure in both. We do not, however, allege this as a reason or argument, but merely as an illustration.

3. We have room for but a word or two in relation to the third class of objections raised by Mr. Palmer against the Catholic doctrine of satisfaction. He opines that it should be rejected, because it tends to trouble our peace of conscience, and to torment us with doubt and perplexity! Here are his words:

"And when is this fear to be removed? When is the sinner to be at peace with God? When is he to look with joy and love to God as a reconciled and loving Father? NEVER IN THIS LIFE. . . . . And is this the *peace* and *consolation* which you offer to burdened consciences? Are these the blessings which are to flow on those who go to you to heal their wounds, and soothe their afflictions?" &c.*

* Ecclesiasticus v, 5.

Well, this is all pathetic enough. Much do we regret, if it were only for Mr. Palmer's sake, that the way to heaven is not wider and smoother than Christ declared it to be, both by word and example. This doctrine of satisfaction is surely not agreeable to flesh and blood; but we are told that "flesh and blood can not possess the kingdom of God."† We would humbly suggest that it is barely possible to "offer *too much* peace and consolation to burdened consciences;" and that there are those who say "peace, when there is no peace." Is it not more likely that an humble and fervent Christian, who strives to imitate Christ in his sufferings, and to become with him a victim of sin, will enjoy a real and solid peace and consolation, than the one who is willing to suffer nothing for his sins, or, at least, nothing more than he can possibly help? The yoke of Christ is indeed sweet, and his burden light; but it is still a *yoke* and a *burden*, and the yoke is sweet and the burden light only to those who bear them willingly and with love, for the sake of Christ, and in union with Christ. *His* grace sweetens and lightens what would otherwise be bitter and intolerably burdensome.

In defending and reducing to practice the doctrine of satisfaction, the Catholic church *proves* herself to be the true spouse of Christ, deeply sympathizing with *him* in his sufferings, and entering into the spirit of *his* great atonement. "Flesh and blood hath not revealed this doctrine to her, but the Father who is in heaven."‡ It is plainly unearthly, and of heavenly origin; man *could not* possibly have devised it; it is plainly supernatural. With how many blessings has not this doctrine strewn the earth! How many splendid temples, how many magnificent hospitals for the sick, how many asylums for the afflicted of every class, has it not erected! Visit the noble institutions of the middle ages, still existing all over Europe; ask the history of their foundation; and some old record will inform you that they were reared, in many cases, by opulent penitents—*ad expianda peccata*—for the expiation of the sins committed in their past life! § Fingant quid tale hæretici! Let innovators produce monuments like these!

* Letter iii, p. 8. † 1 Cor. xv, 50. ‡ Matth. xvi, 17.
§ See "Ages of Faith," by Digby, vol. ii.

GUARDIAN ANGELS.

Of all the rich blessings our Father has given,
Since Jesus first purchased our title to heaven,
Since Mary has deigned for poor sinners to plead,
And for our salvation e'er to intercede,
None claims from us gratitude deeper than this,
That angels are sent from the bright realms of bliss,
To hover around us through weal and through wo,
To pray for, and shield us, wherever we go.

God's mercies are scattered, are strewn all around;
In lavish profusion they freely abound:
We gaze on the sky, it is radiant with light;
Ten thousand bright spangles illumine the night;
Or if it is morning, the sun, in his pride,
Seems through the deep azure in splendor to ride.
The earth teems with fruits, and the shrubs bend with bloom,
Each zephyr that fans us is rich with perfume;
The music of waters, the carol of birds,
The prattle of children, the soft whispered words
Of endearment from those we so ardently love,
Are heard morn and evening. Around and above,
All is sunlight and gladness; yet, oh! more than these,
Than all the rich treasures of earth, air, and seas,
Is this, that our Father has given us to share
The ne'er wearied friendship, the kind constant care
Of that GUARDIAN ANGEL, that friend ever near,
That pilot our storm-riven vessel to steer,
Who clings to the helm when the bark would be lost,
On the billowy sea of uncertainty tost;
Who steadily guides to that haven of rest,
That Eden of glory, the home of the blest.

O who can reflect on the mercies of heaven,
Can dwell on the blessings so bounteously given,
E'en to the most wretched, and not bend the knee
In gratitude, Father of mercies, to thee!

Though torrent and whirlwind, though thunder and fire
Rage round him, proclaiming Jehovah's dread ire,
The Christian may tremble, but feels no despair;
His GUARDIAN assures him, and, bending in prayer,
He looks up to heaven; the tempest he fears
Is passing, and lo! a fair rainbow appears!
He hails the bright omen, and, buoyant with hope,
Goes forth, newly armed, with temptation to cope.

If writhing with pain on a feverish bed,
With no downy pillow to comfort his head,
With no tender mother to wipe the cold dew,
And no gentle sister caressing, to woo

The weight of oppression from off his sad heart,
Or brush the big tears that, unbidden, may start,
Still why does his countenance beam with a smile?
'Mid torture and agony, what can beguile
The poor friendless, destitute sufferer's groan?
Oh no, he's not friendless! he feels not alone;
He knows that his GUARDIAN ANGEL is by,
To waft up to heaven each penitent sigh!
Aye, the poorest, the loneliest, still have a friend,
Who, through all their hard trials, will ever defend—
Will aid, will protect them, will sweetly dispel
The darkness that else in their bosoms would dwell.

When sorrows have come—and they come to us all—
When God seemed in anger some darling to call;
When direst bereavement our heart-strings has rent,
And we, 'neath a burden of sorrow, have bent,
Oh who has not felt, in such seasons of grief,
A *something* that brought to his soul sweet relief;
A voice undefined, but still gentle and kind,
Like soft, distant melody, borne on the wind;
That told him he'd meet in those regions afar,
Beyond the blue home of yon beautiful star,
Those he mourned, and that death had no power to sever
The links that would bind them in heaven for ever!

Say not, it is fancy; oh let not the fire
Of this lovely, this comforting faith, e'er expire;
Let not the cold sneer of the infidel chill
The flame that, in moments of anguish, will thrill
Through the heart with a genial, a confident glow,
That none but the Christian soul ever can know!
By the proud, scoffing skeptic, this solace so kind,
Is deemed an illusion, a dream of the mind;
This ANGEL of mercy, with all his fond care,
Is spurned as a vision, a phantom of air:
While still to the faithful this GUARDIAN friend
Seems one on whose kindness they always depend,
Who saves them from peril, from guilt and despair,
Who aids them by counsel, protection, and prayer.

And, oh! should not mortals thus richly possessed,
With ardor and gratitude own the bequest,
And, by deep adoration and fervency, prove
How they prize such transcendent, unmerited love!
The faithless may scoff, the philosopher sneer,
But, O GUARDIAN ANGELS, still, still fondly dear,
Protect us, pray for us, by day and by night,
Till we meet where the ransomed for ever unite! S. R. T.

Louisville, Ky., May 19th, 1845.

ON THE USE OF IMAGES IN CHURCHES.

OD, and God alone, is the object of our worship and adoration. "The Lord thy God shalt thou adore, and him only shalt thou serve." * But we place images and paintings in our churches in order to aid us in collecting and concentrating our wandering thoughts, and to enliven our memories in regard to heavenly things. The council of Trent defines two things as the belief of the Catholic church on this head.

1*st.* "That images of Christ and the blessed Virgin, and of the other saints, are to be exposed and retained, particularly in churches."

2*d.* "That due honor and respect are to be paid to them."†

This is the whole of the Catholic doctrine. We do not believe that any *virtue* resides in them for which they ought to be honored; the respect we show them by placing them in our churches is referred to their prototypes, or the persons and things which they represent. We do not believe that any divinity is in them, for these images can not see, hear, or help us; but we keep them in our churches because such representations are admirably calculated to bring our cold and stagnant feelings into closer communion with the persons whom we love and cherish. Thus, we maintain that respect is due to the Bible, to the holy name of Jesus, and to churches; and with St. Paul, we only "give honor to whom honor is due;"‡ and we believe that this honor may be given to those objects without at all derogating from the majesty of God, and the divine worship which is due to him alone.

This is the simple and obvious ground on which we uphold our practice. Let us now see the origin of this use of images and pictures of sacred things, and the motives that induced the church to ornament her temples with them.

The use of images does not appear to have been *publicly* introduced into churches until about the days of Constantine the great. Previously to his time they were only to be found in the catacombs of Rome and Naples. The Christians, during the period in question, were exposed to the most bitter persecution. They were deprived alike of the free exercise of their religion, and of the privilege of unfolding its sublime dogmas to others. Hence, in the absence of more effectual means of disseminating the fundamental truths of Christianity, they had recourse to a series of allegorical and biblical representations, relating principally to the fall of man, to his redemption, and to the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

As soon, however, as the church emerged from her hiding places, she turned her attention to the building up of temples worthy her divine Founder. These she ornamented with paintings descriptive of facts and passages in the life and death of Christ, and of his apostles. These paintings were employed chiefly as means of instruction.

Could I introduce you, kind reader, into some of our magnificent European churches of the middle ages, you would there see how painting and sculpture were employed by the church for the instruction of her poor and illiterate children. From the Gothic and Grecian windows of her churches she poured instruction through the curious, but delighted eye, of the simple, uneducated peasants whom, before the noble art of printing was invented, it was almost impossible to teach to read. The same windows that admitted physical, poured in also intellectual and religious light, and taught the poor the whole history of redemption, and of the establishment of the Christian religion. When the Christian art of painting emerged from the obscurity of the catacombs to unfold the triumphant banner of the cross, how admirable its sublime tendency, its noble expression, its lofty style! In a series of paintings which adorned the walls and windows of the churches, the uneducated beheld the Saviour in all the stages of his progress, from the

* Matt. iv, 10. † Sess. xxv, de Invocat. SS., p. 289.
‡ Rom. xiii, 7.

lowly but hallowed cradle of Bethlehem, to the sacred cross of Calvary. Let us hear an enlightened traveller of this country describing the venerable old Gothic church of Rouen, in France, the stained glass windows of which are still singularly perfect.

"Can we not account for the statuary, the bass-relief, and the stained glass windows of the continental churches, by the same causes that gave rise to the Biblia Pauperum in England in the early part of the fifteenth century? Books were scarce and dear, and what there were the *people* could not read. It was necessary to devise some means by which the mass might acquire at least a rude knowledge of the facts of Scripture history, and none was so likely to be successful as the representation of such facts in visible forms, striking to the eye. Indeed no other means were possible, so long as the people were unable to read. Now what the rough wood-cuts of the Bible for the poor were to the English peasantry, the stained windows of cathedrals and churches were to the French, and, perhaps, in a still higher degree. The paintings, bass-reliefs, and statues, are all memorials, however, either of facts in the Bible, or traditions in the church. Thus the whole edifice is an open volume of religious history; and turn where you will, your eye falls upon a page of it, legible, too, by the most ignorant boor. Every column, every altar, every projection, has its story to tell."*

In these pictures Christians beheld the glad tidings of the Saviour's birth announced by angels, amidst the silence and stillness of the night, to humble shepherds tending their flocks on Juda's hills. They saw the heavens brightening, and the angelic host descending in beautiful array, and hymning, in accents divine, the sublime anthem, "Glory to God on high, and peace on earth to men of good will!" In another, they beheld a star moving in silent beauty through the blue depths of the east, and leading its wise men onward, till its silvery ray fell on the birth-place of the Redeemer, and then and there they saw mystic offerings presented to their infant Saviour. They beheld his flight into Egypt, in order to escape the cruelty of Herod, who immolated to his ruthless ambition all the male children of the Jews found in the vicinity of his birthplace. They beheld him giving signs of precocious wisdom, and disputing, while yet a child, with the doctors in the temple.

The precursor Baptist, the last and the greatest of the prophetic train, was seen in another sublime painting, pointing out to astonished multitudes Jesus Christ, on the banks of the Jordan, as the Lamb of God who was to take away the sins of the world, whilst the almighty Father proclaimed his eternal generation, as the mystic Dove overshadowed his head, yet reeking from the consecrated streams. Another represented his transfiguration on Thabor; there lie prostrate the disciples, dazzled by divine light; above them, surrounded by a miraculous glory, the Saviour floats in air, in serene beatitude, beaming forth those rays which he emitted before the daystar was created, shedding on Moses and Elias a divine effulgence, and showing to all his followers a glimpse of that glory which awaits them in another life.

He was next seen, like a second Isaac, ascending the tragic mount, bearing his cross in silent anguish, his heart bleeding for the sins of mankind. Then was he seen expiring under an accumulation of wo, while all nature is in mourning around him. The sun, in conscious horror, withdraws his light; the earth, that receives his blood, reels to its very centre; the winds of heaven sob and moan around him; the tombs give up their dead to increase the horrors of the scene; the veil of the temple is rent in twain, its guardian angels shriek and disappear; and, in the midst of this appalling convulsion of the elements, the Saviour of the world was seen bowing down his august head, and expiring to save men from eternal death.

Were not such paintings well calculated to soften the hardest heart? The view of such thrilling representations was calculated to teach more than elaborately written volumes.

"Can you," asks Bishop Baines, "behold such an object unmoved? Can you fix upon the cross a vacant eye? Can you gaze on it, and not reflect how great was his goodness who thus suffered; how criminal those sins which caused such sufferings; how sincere ought to be your sorrow in having participated in the commission of them? It is to excite such emotions that the image or painting is placed in the church; and let me ask you, *could* a more appropriate object stand upon a Christian altar, or be placed before the eyes of

* Durbin, vol. i, pp. 29, 30.

a Christian assembly, when they meet to pay their worship to their divine Redeemer, where every mind should be impressed, and every heart penetrated with the remembrance of his sufferings, the source of all our happiness, and all our hope?"

Such paintings have often overcome religious prejudice, and have wrung from the beholder an acknowledgment of their powerful effect.

"But the crucifixion," says Mr. Durbin, "by Vandyke, preserved in the museum, struck me most forcibly; I could not repress indignation, sorrow, even tears, as I gazed upon the image of the crucified, stooping meekly, and yielding his bleeding back to the strokes of the scourge, while the blue marks of the thong verged into blackness, and the dark blood trickled from the fearful wounds."*

"The library of Bâle," he says in another place, "is valuable and interesting. On the ground-floor is a gallery of Holbein's paintings, the most striking of which is the series on the passion of Christ, depicting the succession of events from the garden of Gethsemane to the descent from the cross. I never was so affected by a picture, and, for the first time, felt that my *religious* feelings were improved by gazing at one."†

But let us enter again into one of the early temples of Christianity, which still stand as monuments of a dearer and a happier age.

In another picture we behold our blessed Lord on the happy morning of the resurrection rising gloriously from the tomb, like a giant refreshed from his slumbers, conquering the conqueror of millions, divesting death of half its horrors by rescuing himself from the chilly, withering grasp of the hitherto absolute monarch of the tomb. Another painted him ascending from Mount Olivet, surrounded by the angelic throng, "leading captivity captive," and carrying the smoking blood of expiation into the midst of adoring angels, to be poured out as a rich libation before his Father's everlasting throne, so that he might come forth to bless those who had been made perfect and redeemed. Still another represented the mystic tongues of fire descending, imparting to the apostolic band that glowing eloquence which enlightened a world and enkindled in so many hearts the flame of ardent charity.

* Ibid. p. 276. † P. 249.

Now, in this series of paintings that adorned the walls and windows of our churches, without the aid of books was unfolded the whole history of the Gospel, shining forth, and glowing on the canvass, before the eyes of the beholders; and instruction was thus communicated in the most pleasing way to an unlettered people. But these paintings conveyed more than mere historical instruction. They were not only books, but sermons. They elevated the mind of the spectator to piety and devotion; they made him *feel* that he was in a holy place, as if he had already come "to the heavenly Jerusalem, and to the company of many thousands of angels,"* and to the spirits of the just made perfect. The inspiration of holy thoughts, thus caught from the very walls and windows, roused him from a state of coldness and tepidity, to zeal, love, and fervor. Who could, in fact, gaze on Christ—on whose countenance the angels wish to look, who became obedient unto death in its most cruel forms, and to the death of the cross—without a deep, soul-felt sense of his sufferings, and an abiding hatred and horror for sin, the cause of his death? Who could witness his glorious and triumphant resurrection and ascension without *feeling* his heart swelling with a sense of victory, and without participating in all the glories of a triumph?

How much more lively is the effect of painting of such scenes than a mere verbal description? Words are addressed to the ear; paintings speak to the eye, the finest of all the organs, and the one whose affections produce a much deeper and more lasting impression than the duller perceptions of the other senses. Who could behold in the niches of the churches the statues of martyrs crowned, and raising aloft the palm of victory, without breathing a fervent wish to participate in their glory, by an imitation of their deeds and heroic acts of virtue!

The great St. Augustin, seduced by the syren blandishments of a deceiving world, animated himself by meditating on subjects so touching. "Canst thou not do," said he to himself, "what these heroes have done? Were these men lions, and art thou a timid fawn? No, they were like thee, weak; they were timorous, yet they arrived at the haven of salvation. Why then dost thou not imitate them?"

* Heb. xii, 22.

Thus did he encourage himself to snap in sunder the chains that yet bound him, and to come forth as a candidate for like honors.

"Often," writes an old Roman historian, "often have I heard that Quintus Maximus, Publius Scipio, and other famous and renowned men of our city, were accustomed to say that they never looked upon the portraits of their ancestry without feeling their souls burning with a desire to imitate their virtues. The contemplation of their deeds raised such a glow of emulation in their hearts that it never could be extinguished until their own virtues equalled in splendor the glory of their ancestors."

This observation is as just and true to nature, as it is beautiful and eloquent. Rome, when at the zenith of her glory, did not forget to erect statues to perpetuate the memory and the glorious deeds of her mighty dead. Her departed heroes stood forth conspicuous in the capital, in the forum, and on the field of Mars. The humblest citizen could look forward to the day when his name, too, might be inscribed on the chronicles of his country, when the memory of his deeds might be preserved on the canvass, or perpetuated in marble. As he passed along the streets, or repaired to the scenes of public festivity or private relaxation, the monuments of departed excellence were ever before him. The image of the patriot of other times looked on approvingly from its pedestal, and even the lips that moved not sent forth their mute encouragement. Theirs was a noiseless eloquence, which supported the sufferer in his country's cause; which discoursed sweet music to him in the hour of his darkest despondency. When his heart was heaving within him, under the bitter feeling of injustice; when his actions were misconstrued, and his motives suspected, or when he became the injured victim of popular envy, the sustaining influence of such paintings came soothingly over his soul, supporting him in the hour of his adversity, cheering his sinking spirits, and, like a herald from on high, telling him of other times, and of other men who would do justice to his character.

If the contemplation of the statues and portraits of ancient heroes could excite such soothing emotions, could rouse the spectators to such deeds of martial virtue and heroic valor; if a Leonidas or a Miltiades of Greece, if the Scipios and Fabii of Rome could cheer and fire their soldiers by haranguing them in the presence of the images of their illustrious countrymen, and telling them that they, too, should have statues erected to eternize their names, if they should but signalize themselves by feats of daring and prowess; why should not the contemplation of the images of Christ and of his glorious apostles and martyrs produce an effect equally potent on the mind of the Christian? Why should they not elevate his soul above the mean pursuits of earthly ambition to that true heroism and grandeur which consists in following the precepts of the Gospel and the examples of the saints? Surrounded by such paintings as I have described, why may not the Christian orator animate his audience to aspire to deeds worthy of their sainted ancestry, to rally around the standard of the cross, and to battle not for an earthly crown, but for one fashioned by the hand of God himself? Is it wrong to make use of paintings for such purposes as these? Hear the great Leibnitz on this subject:

"On the other hand, there appears a manifest utility and reason for the use of images in religion. For why do we read or listen to histories, but in order that the images they convey may be impressed upon our memory? But since the images thus expressed are extremely fleeting, nor always sufficiently distinct and clear, we should regard, as a great gift of God, the arts of painting and sculpture, by which we obtain lasting images, expressing objects with the utmost accuracy, vivacity and beauty, by the sight of which (since it is not always in our power to consult the original) the internal images are renewed, and, as a seal on wax, more deeply impressed upon the mind. Now since the use of images is so advantageous, where, I ask, shall they be more fitly employed, than where it is of the greatest moment that the impressions on our memory should be of the most lasting and vivid character—that is, in the duties of piety and of the love of God? Especially since we have already proved that the most special use of all the arts and sciences—and consequently of painting—should be devoted to the worship of God."*

He then quotes the council of Trent, praises its principles, and continues:

"Having established, then, that no other reverence of images is admitted than simply the veneration of the original in the presence of the image, there can be no more of idolatry therein, than in the veneration which we show

* Systema Theol., pp. 122—4.

to God and Christ when his most sacred name is pronounced; for names, also, are signs, and indeed, of a class far inferior to images, since they represent the thing much less vividly. Therefore, when it is said that an image is honored, nothing more is meant than when it is said that 'in the name of Jesus the knee is bent,' that 'the name of God is blessed,' or 'that glory is given to his name,' and to adore before the external image is no more censurable than to adore before the internal image, which is painted on our imaginations; for there is no other use of the external, than to render the internal image more vivid."*

He concludes thus:

"All things considered, therefore, since I see that there is nothing in the veneration of images, as approved by the Tridentine fathers, which is opposed to the divine honor, since there does not appear in these times any danger of that idolatry which transfers to others the honor due to God—whereas all men sufficiently know that the omnipotent God alone is worshipped with divine honor—since further, there exists a use of so many ages in the church, which could not without the greatest revolutions be abolished; since, in fine, abuses being removed, the practice is of very great fruit in the maintenance of piety, I conclude that the use of venerating the original in the presence of an image is rightly and piously retained, provided it be carefully circumscribed, with the utmost caution, within its proper limits."†

Such is the candid belief of Baron Leibnitz, one of the most gifted minds that ever lived—"the equal of Puffendorf in jurisprudence, the witty antagonist of Bossuet in scholastic divinity; the successful opponent of Locke in psychology, and the rival of Newton in the unexplored regions of abstract mathematics."‡

In the days of trial and persecution, painting had still another mission to fulfil—namely: to fortify its victims against the insolent threats of their destroyers and against the fear of death. For this purpose were represented the sufferings and patience of Job, the three youths in the fiery furnace, Daniel in the den of lions, or Pharaoh and his host overturned in the Red Sea, as a prophetical anticipation of the final triumph of Christianity. The church, then, painted the martyrdom of St. Stephen catching a glimpse of the beatific vision in the very agonies of death, and praying for his executioners; and St. Andrew, contemplating with rapture the long desired instrument of his martyrdom, and exclaiming, "hail, precious cross, that has been consecrated to the body of my Lord, and adorned with his limbs as with rich jewels! I come to thee exulting and glad, receive me with joy into thy arms!"

Thus did the church cheer on her children to endure the ills of life, and to suffer the torments of death. Notwithstanding ten bloody persecutions, Christianity grew rapidly in the very heart of pagan Rome, as a night flower that is protected by the shade; and its roots spread in a soil enriched with the remains of the saints, and yet moist with the generous blood they had shed in her defence. These things she has never forgotten. When she ascended the throne of the Cæsars and gave her cross as a standard to the Roman legions, she reproduced these beautiful paintings to perpetuate the triumph and glory of her devoted children.

The church, ever alive to the spiritual wants of her people, also employed this excellent mode of instruction to rouse them to a lively sense of the awful judgments of God. For this purpose she spread before them paintings of the last judgments. In them sin and despair, indelibly stamped upon every feature of the wicked, were represented in the most appalling manner; and in them, too, were delineated lovely wreaths of blessed souls floating in air as they rise from earth to heaven. Such paintings as these inspired the Christian poet with the eloquent and pathetic strains of the *Dies iræ*.

Such were the ends the church had in view while adorning her temples with paintings. Bede relates of his abbot, Biscop, that he brought from Rome, and placed in his church, paintings of sacred things—of the blessed Virgin, and the twelve Apostles, and of the evangelical history—in order that all who entered the church, though ignorant of letters, might, to whatever side they turned, contemplate either the loving countenances of Christ and of his apostles, the mysteries of the Lord's incarnation and death, or the final judgment; and that the spectacle might move them to devotion.

Thus all things in the church forcibly reminded Christians of the passion and sacred humanity of Christ; and, gazing on such scenes, they might feel as if in Bethlehem or on Calvary.

"And, I fancy, it would be no difficult

* Ibid. p. 144. † Ibid. pp. 154—6.
‡ Dublin Review, No. 30, p. 395.

task," writes Dr. Wiseman, in his letters to Jno. Poynder, "with these objects before us, to expound and fully develop to the ancient Roman the Christian faith: the life of the Redeemer beginning with his birth from a virgin, to his death upon a cross; the testimony of his doctrine and the power which accompanied it, exhibited in the triumph of the first among his martyrs. And methinks this ancient heathen would have an idea of a religion immensely different from that which he had professed—the religion of the meek and of the humble, of the persecuted and the modest, of the devout and the chaste. I believe, too, that by seeing the substitution of symbol for symbol—of the cross, the badge of ignominy, with its unresisting victim, for the haughty thunderer—of the chastest of virgins for the lascivious Venus—of the forgiving Stephen, for the avenging god of war—he would thereby conceive a livelier idea of the overthrow of his idolatry by the mildest of doctrines, of the substitution of Christianity for heathenism, than if the temple had been merely stripped and left a naked hall, or a tottering ruin. And yet we are told that little or no change has taken place in the Pantheon by the substitution of the saints for all the gods!

"After having thus allowed the heathen to discover, if he could, his ancient worship and morality in the very Roman church which you had chosen, and explained to him the doctrines there taught, I would bring him to the only splendid temple in this country (England) wherein the Catholic religion has never been exercised, and where alone it has left no vestige of its truths and practices. I would bring him, after duly paying his entrance fee, into the cathedral of St. Paul's, and desire him to guess the religion to which it belonged. Would not his first question be, does it belong to any religion? is it a place of worship at all? No altar, no chapel, no emblem of any holy thought visible: no point towards which men turn, as strongly concentrating the divine presence; no emblem of a peculiar dedication; not a worshipper or a reverential spectator; not one who, as he crosses the threshold, prepares his soul, as if approaching God, in prayer. Would he, so far, see any thing to show him that he stood in a Christian temple? Might not the organ suggest to him that it is a hall for festive meetings? Might not the mouldy banners that wave above him, lead him to imagine that he was in the curia or senate-house of Rome?

"But while he thus felt himself at a loss to discover what religion claimed the possession of this temple, I would direct his attention another way, and bid him look among the tombs and costly monuments which surround him, for some intimation of what God is here worshipped, and what virtues taught. There he sees emblems in sufficient number—not the cross or the dove, or the olive branch, as on the ancient tomb, but the drum and the trumpet, the boarding-pike and cannon. But who are they whose attitudes and actions are deemed the fit ornaments for this religious temple? Men rushing forward, with sword in hand, to animate their followers to the breach, or falling down while boarding the enemy's deck; heroes, if you choose, benefactors to their country, but surely not the illustrators of religion. Of one it is said that he died as a Roman would certainly have wished him after having grappled with his enemy's ship, and rendered the destruction of one or both secure; the epitaph of another is expressed in the words of his commander's despatch; that of a third, in the rote of the House of Commons, not a word of a single Christian virtue, of a thought for God, of a hope for heaven; not a hint that one professed, or believed in any religion. And would not the heathen rejoice to have found a temple, where the courage of the three hundred Fabii, of the self-devotion of the Decii, or the virtues of the Scipios, were so plainly taught and held up to the practical admiration and imitation of man?

"And how would his delight increase, on more closely inspecting the emblems under which these virtues, or their circumstances, are expressed. Sea and river gods, with their oozy crowns, and outpouring vases; the Ganges with his fish and calabash; the Thames, with the *genii* of his confluent streams; and the Nile, with his idol and the *sphynx*; *Victory* girt up as of old, placing earthly laurels on the brows of the falling; Fame, with its ancient trumpet, blasting forth their worldly merits; Clio, the offspring of Apollo, recording their history, and, besides these, new creations of gods and goddesses. *Rebellion and fraud, valor* and *sensibility*; *Britannia*, the very copy of his own worshipped *Rome*. This assemblage of ancient deities as the only symbols to instruct his eye would assuredly go far to confirm him, either that his ancient religion, its emblems, and its morality, had never been supplanted, or had lately been restored. Little would it boot to explain to him how, behind that screen, a sacred book was read to a few people once a week—to empty benches every day—which teaches man to abhor his idolatry and worship God in spirit. . . . All this would, I think, perplex him the more. If you are not permitted to make any images, or to have them in your temple, he would ask, why break the law only in favor of warriors and river gods? If these are allowed, why are the Christians of Rome to be denounced and anathematized for erecting those of Christ and his saints? And truly, I have no hesitation in saying that, if he reasoned as you have done, and followed your principles of judgment; if he pronounced upon religion by the shell and not by the kernel—by the body and not by the soul—by the outward forms, not by the belief which they express, and if he persisted, like

you, in giving credit to his own impressions and preconceived judgment, rather than to the protestations and declarations of those with whom he deals, I have no hesitation in saying that he would see a much fainter impress of Christian thought in the Protestant than in the Catholic temple—much greater memorials of proscribed idolatry in the English than in the Roman cathedral."

But I may be told that the use of painting is forbidden in Scripture. Methinks I hear some one ask what Scripture proof can you allege to justify your practice? No one, I suppose, will say that it is unlawful to have pictures in churches, on the ground that they are forbidden by the commandment given to the Jews of old. Yet we have been ignorantly accused of corrupting the decalogue to screen our conduct. It is even said that the commandment regarding images has been suppressed. If so, I would ask by whom? By the decree of some council, or by the bull of some pope? Let us have the date of such documents. By private consent? What would it have profited the church to have done so? Would it justify her practice? No, it would only have aggravated her guilt. Would it conceal the impiety? From whom would it conceal it? Not from her adversaries, who would gladly expose her for her corruption of God's holy word. Not, surely, from the people of her own communion. How could the church, in fact, have suppressed the commandment? Certainly by no other method, than by suppressing it from every Bible, book, and catechism in the world. For if she left it in any, the fraud would have been instantly detected. Now it so happens that it is to be found in every edition of the Bible that ever was published, and in every Catholic book that explains at large the commandments. The truth is, the charge is wholly groundless.

The first question, then, we must examine, is this: is the making of *all* images forbidden, or are we only forbidden to worship them? The commandment evidently does not forbid the making of images in general. If it did, it would be a sin to take a portrait of a friend, even of the father of our country! If so, then the United States mint is a factory of idols, and every money holder in the land is an idolater! If so, then no monument can be allowed in a church, and no altar piece; and yet it is a fact that the church of England has placed many paintings in her temples. We can not, therefore, conclude that the making of images in general is forbidden.

Neither does the commandment forbid the making of *holy* images, for the very obvious reason that God himself *commanded* them to be made. In the tabernacle there were two cherubim in the Holy of Holies, and the walls of the great Jewish temple were sculptured with graven images. There is no doubt whatever that the temple was adorned with carved images and representations of the human countenance as much as it was possible for any building to be.

The whole question then turns upon this: whether Catholics are justified in making use of images as sacred memorials, and in praying before them as inspiring faith and devotion? I may be asked what warrant there is in Scripture for all this?

I might answer that I seek none; or rather I might ask, what authority there is to deprive me of such objects? It is the natural right of man to use any thing towards promoting the worship of God, which is not in any way forbidden. I might as well be asked, what warrant there is in Scripture for the building of churches, for the use of the organ, for the ringing of bells, for music, and for a thousand other things that appertain to the worship of God as practised by Christians of nearly all denominations? Do I want a warrant; do I require Scripture, for instance, for the use of the organ? Certainly not; because if the thing be innocent in itself, and serve to raise our hearts towards God, we consider that we have a right to use it; and nothing but a positive divine enactment can deprive us of this right.

And I wish to know whether any one would charge me with bad feelings if, on coming before the representation or image of any one whom I had loved and lost, I stood before it, fixed in veneration and affection, as though the object was really before me? And even if my eyes should fill with tears, and I should appear to address it with feelings of affectionate enthusiasm, I might be guilty of some extravagance in sentiment, of too vivid a feeling; but surely no one would say that I was guilty of superstition or idolatry in its regard.

Such is precisely all that the Catholic is taught to believe regarding the images set up in our churches. They are memorials in

the same way as other representations are, and we consider them well calculated to excite in the beholder similar feelings, only of a religious class.

"We must bring down religion to the apprehensions of the people, the best way we can. Images and paintings are but so many conductors, which bring the light from heaven, and direct it into the safe channel of their influence upon art, drawing forth the divinity of genius, whose works, thus inspired, elicit in their turn the devout yearnings of the spectator, thus engendering a holy action and reaction. I need not adduce instances; for the fact has been established at all times and in all countries where religion has availed itself of the artist's aid. If we are to banish from our churches the poetry of painting and sculpture, why not proscribe the muse herself and suppress the psalms? Why not interdict the music of the choir."*

It is conformable to the best feelings of our nature to respect the portraits of those we love. A devoted mother is deprived of her loved child; she procures a miniature of it, and often kisses it with streaming eyes and a throbbing brow. Another has lost a fond mother, who watched over his childhood; he procures her portrait and places it in the most conspicuous part of the house; he never looks upon it but with a glow of the most affectionate feeling. This, exclaims a tender child, is the image of an affectionate father, who sleeps upon a foreign shore. But why describe such scenes? In the family circle feelings so sacred are often indulged in, which baffle all description. God himself implanted these feelings in the human heart when he enlightened us with reason.

May we indulge such emotions in the family circle without any crime, and must we check or stifle them before the sacred emblem of redemption, or the portraits of the apostles and martyrs? We ornament our parlors with the portraits of parents and of children to recall their fond remembrance; can it be a sin in us to use the portraits of the founders of Christianity for the same purpose, or for decorating our churches?

The portraits of Washington and of other illustrious men who have removed from our necks the galling yoke of foreign vassalage, are highly prized, and hold a conspicuous place in our houses, and we never look upon them without feeling our hearts swell with emotions of gratitude; can it then be wrong in us to respect the images of Christ, who freed us, not from temporal, but from an eternal slavery? Now, if a parent, if a child, if a patriot can indulge such feelings without sin, can it be a crime in a Christian to exult when he sees the cross of Christ elevated in the sanctuary of religion? Surely not.

"Forbid it every generous feeling," exclaims the lamented England. Forbid it every sentiment of pure religion! Can the tender recollection of paintings representing the mysteries of Calvary be idolatry? But why dwell longer on such a topic. Nature and the pure affections of the human heart are our best vindication. To the calm, to the unbiased, to the candid, we confidently appeal. J. M.

* Horace Smith.

OLD SCHOOL PRESBYTERIANS *versus* CATHOLIC BAPTISM.

Minute adopted by the General Assembly in relation to Baptism in the Romish church. Presbyterian, June 7th, 1845.

OUR readers remember that the general assembly of the (O. S.) Presbyterian church, which was convened in May last in Cincinnati, discussed and decided in the negative the question of the validity of baptism given in the Catholic church. The debate seems to have been carried on with some animation: speeches for and against, but chiefly against the validity of our baptism, were paraded in the religious and secular papers, and thus did the orators of the assembly succeed in demonstrating their unflinching opposition to popery; for it has now become obsolete among men to leave the left hand in ignorance of the good which the right hand does, and, although we are taught to place our confidence in Him who seeth the good work in secret, it is a very common thing for people to promulgate to the four winds whatever they have thought or said. On reading the grave but strange conclusion arrived at by the general assembly, that the baptism of the Catholic church is not valid, we were not a little amused, and, at the same time, we felt that this ludicrous proceeding should be abandoned to the utter silence which it so justly deserves; but on reflection we have come to the resolution of presenting the readers of the Magazine with some remarks on the subject, not so much because the claims of our modern Presbyterians call for a serious refutation, as because it is well for Catholics to have an insight into the inconsistency, the sophistry, the contradictions, and, we may add, the gross ignorance of certain opponents of the true church.

It may be well to state at the outset that this general assembly of the Presbyterian church which ventured to give a decision on a question decided from the origin of Christianity, consisted of some less than two hundred voters, from differents parts of the United States, one half of whom claim to be ministers or pastors, the other half *mere laymen*, called ruling elders, and altogether disqualified for the discussion of theological matters. The Presbyterians, it is well known, revere John Calvin as their founder; but Calvinists form other societies, the principal of which is the Congregationalists, who are almost as numerous as the Presbyterians proper; the former were not, of course, represented in the general assembly, neither were the Presbyterians of Scotland and England and Ireland, nor the Huguenots of France, so that, on the whole, this was the decision of a small portion of the Presbyterian church, or the decision of a mere handful of men; the more so as the Presbyterian church was split in 1837 and 1838 into two branches, nearly equal in numerical strength, but very opposite in views and tenets, and both claiming to be the genuine Presbyterian church. One branch has kept up, and perhaps even increased that spirit of bigotry and fanaticism which shows itself on every page of English and Scotch history in the 17th century. It is the branch that met at Cincinnati. The other branch has adopted more humane and tolerant forms. With the latter body we have at present nothing to do. It is hard to give a name to either of the two branches that will not be on some ground objectionable. The party which met in Cincinnati is often called Old School, or Old Style, also Scotch Presbyterians, the other New School, New Style, and American Presbyterians. We disclaim all intention to use what may be considered a nickname, but for the sake of distinction it will be necessary to employ some of the names given above. The Old School Presbyterians count in their official report of 1843 about one hundred and sixty thousand members in communion. For the sake of comparison, we may add that the

Catholics number in their ranks more millions than they reckon thousands.

To return to the question, a query on the validity of the baptism given in the Catholic church having been put by the timorous ministers of Ohio, it was discussed for a few days in the assembly, and then, the previous question having been demanded, there were one hundred and sixty-nine votes against the validity of baptism in the church of Rome, six for the validity, and four *non-liquets!* We must add that the six dissentient voters presented a counter-report wherein they express their reasons for dissenting from the majority of the brethren. The meeting then appointed a committee to draw up a minute expressive of the views of the house in deciding against the validity of baptisms by Catholic priests. By this decision they have managed to exhibit two points in a very prominent light. In the first place, they show their total ignorance and disregard of the tenets of all Christian churches from the earliest ages, and then an aggravated bitterness of zeal against the ancient church, which proves them in this respect at least the worthy disciples of John Calvin, who, having failed in obtaining in that church the preferment he aimed at, swore, in a spirit of humility and forbearance, that he would make it repent of the refusal.

It is singular enough that a few preachers could have thought of settling this question by vote, and have proceeded in their deliberations with a consciousness of its importance and momentous effects. Did these lay and clerical gentlemen imagine that their word was powerful enough to invalidate baptism, and really believe that the poor *papist* depended on their decision, just as the life of a culprit depends on the verdict of a jury? The editor of the paper quoted at the head of this article, returning home from the scene of theological warfare, exults in the idea of having placed the matter at rest.

"The decision of the assembly," he says, "is the only consistent one that could be adopted. In this matter the Roman Catholics have been taken by surprise. They have been effectually attacked in their entrenchments."

We presume, then, that this vote of one hundred and eighty-nine ministers and laymen has killed us dead, and that amongst ourselves the administration of baptism ought to be suspended, while we call upon our Presbyterian friends to introduce us into the church! If their decision has the effect which they seem to give it, would it not be well in the next assembly to settle by vote all controverted questions of every kind? Were they, for instance, to decide that all the planets are inhabited, myriads of living things might be ushered into existence if, perchance, there were none before.

The reader will at once perceive that theological and scientific questions are not determined by mere votes, particularly by the votes of persons who have met from various places, and pronounce, without any preparatory and serious study, without any reference to history, to books, and to other sources of ecclesiastical learning, and with no other qualification to decide than strong prejudice and a great confidence in their own ability. If, however, votes were wanted in this case, we could easily find one thousand for one, gathered not only from a few sectional districts of the United States, but from every part of the globe, from the old and the new world, from Mexico to Russia, from England to the Cape of Good Hope. Suffice it here to quote the council of Trent as an example of a genuine deliberative assembly. Such a body, confining ourselves to the extrinsic evidence of its competency, had at least some chances of success, because its decisions were carried unanimously after a patient and conscientious investigation of facts. There were not to be found among the voters all classes of persons, but the chief pastors of the church, almost three hundred in number, from Italy, France, Germany, Spain, Portugal, Greece, Poland, Hungary, England, Ireland, Flanders, &c. There the various topics presented for examination were discussed by a large number of theologians and canonists who had grown old within the precincts of universities and colleges, or who had otherwise, by their learning and writing, given evidence of their ability to throw light upon the questions proposed. They discussed the questions, but, according to the immemorial usage of the church, they gave no vote. Much less were mere laymen called upon to vote. There was in Trent an immense collection of books opened at all times for consultation, and the questions were debated not by delegates who wished to make a speech and to have their name trumpeted abroad, but by doctors and professors

whose names have reached us untainted by the suspicion of vanity. These doctors did not despatch questions in a day or two, but they remained several *years* in patient and persevering study. There is not a single word in the council which was not conscientiously pondered, and some words cost the theologians of the council weeks and months of labor. None of the articles of faith were written in the decrees till after a perfect unanimity of all the bishops, and it should be also remembered that the Protestants had been repeatedly invited and solicited to come to the council, and every desirable facility afforded them for this purpose. The reader will perceive where the probability lies of a right and reasonable decision, whether in the assembly just described, or among one hundred and eighty-nine clerical and lay persons, who, without any leisure for a patient discussion, despatched all their business in a time which would scarcely have sufficed to shake off the dust collected on their coats during the journey, and gave a decision against which some of the voters firmly protested.

When we inquire into the reasons alleged by the general assembly in support of their decision, all we find on this subject is a minute of a few lines, together with some speeches preparatory to the decision. To dispose first of the speeches, we must say that they exhibit a profound ignorance, and consist exclusively of abusive language against the church. Those learned orators thought that all was done by calling the Catholic church *the mother of harlots;* of course her baptism was not valid. Their discussions exhibit the poorest specimen of theological debate we have ever read, and resemble altogether the maiden essays of school-boy argumentation. We beg leave to introduce this triumphant reasoning of Dr. Reid.

"Are we prepared to acknowledge Pope Gregory XVI and all his cardinals with their red hats as ministers of Christ? If they are not in the church themselves, can they put any one in? Moreover, if the pope has authority to put any one into the church, he has authority to put out, and then we are all out, and we may as well quit the discussion and go home; and where will we stop? If baptism by the church of Rome is valid, then any baptism is valid. For there are none more corrupt who call themselves Christians."

Most conclusive indeed! We will have occasion to return to the intrinsic merit of these remarks. "If they are not in the church themselves, can they put any one in?" We might ask on the same ground, what is the use of any ecclesiastical ministry? Why is the world overflowed with preachers? If they are not in heaven, can they introduce any one into it? Again: will the baptism given by a bad man, though a real O. S. Presbyterian minister, be also invalid? How can he introduce one into the church, he who is the enemy of the Master of the church? But the other argument of the learned doctor is unexampled in point of logical strength. "If the pope has authority to put any one into the church, he has authority to put out, and then we are all out." We admit the conclusion, not the reason on which it is grounded. Any one that baptizes can introduce into the church, and he that introduces into the church can expel from it! According to this, any Presbyterian preacher who can administer baptism validly can exclude the whole world from the church, so as to have it all to himself.

The following words from another orator, Prof. Thornwell, must not be omitted. The dignified character of his language, the coherency of his views, and the sincerity of his protestations seem to us too remarkable to be overlooked.

"She (the church of Rome) is not *the* church or *a* church of Christ. What is she then? She is two things. First. She is Antichrist. Second. She is a civil state, drawing the resources of her government from heaven, earth, and hell. Being a civil state, Rome has no more right to baptize than any other state whatever. . . . . It is objected that by rejecting Romish baptism we invalidate our own, and unchurch ourselves. This objection proceeds upon the false principle that baptism constitutes church membership. But the man is received as a church member *before* his baptism, and is baptized *because* he is a member, not to make him one. . . . . I have no enmity to the church of Rome. But I wish a complete separation from the mother of harlots and mistress of abominations."

We need not stop to consider the arguments contained in these scientific remarks. We may merely observe that the two orators do not agree upon the very nature of baptism. One makes of it an introduction into the church: the other considers it a badge of membership after admission. Could we not with reason say to these gentlemen: agree first among

yourselves upon the definition, the nature and the chief effect of baptism, and then you may think of rejecting ours? Why engage in a foreign war, when you have so much to fight about at home?

It is not our intention, however, to comment upon the speeches made on the occasion referred to; for those speeches, as far as we know, did not receive the sanction of the assembly, and their inconsistencies and oddities must be laid to the charge of their respective authors. But we wish to submit to the reflecting portion of the community a few remarks on the *minute* adopted by the assembly; which, it will be remembered, was drawn up by order, to be presented to the world as an embodiment of the reasons which actuated the assembly, in deciding that the baptism of the Roman church is not valid.

The principal thing that struck us on reading this document is the total absence of Scripture proof. It might have been anticipated that texts would have been found in the Bible in support of the view they have taken of valid baptisms, and indeed many such passages were quoted by St. Cyprian and the Donatists of old, whose error on this subject the Presbyterians of America have renewed and embraced. But although Protestants affect to determine all religious questions by the Bible, and wish to have no other authority than the Bible, they have not had the wisdom in this case to put forth any texts which might be misunderstood plausibly, though falsely, in support of their views. In the art of searching the Scripture, they have been beaten; but modern Presbyterians seem to us inexcusable in not knowing the Scriptural passages which would serve them. Had they opened any of our theological books, they would have found those texts such as they were alleged in former times, and such as they are to be understood according to good sense and tradition. It is manifest that a question like the present can, on Protestant principles, be decided by no other than Scriptural considerations: for it is from Scripture that Protestants must derive their knowledge of the nature and effect of the sacraments. If, then, they venture on a decision without Scripture texts in support of it, they manifestly fall into a contradiction, and reject the very corner-stone of their church edifice. This the Presbyterians have done on the present occasion, unless perhaps they have received some new and extraordinary revelation of heaven, amounting to a Scriptural revelation, a case perhaps not altogether unknown to those gentlemen. Thus they tell us in their Confession of Faith* that the assurance of the divine authority of the Scriptures is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts. Thus did this inward work of the Spirit bearing witness in them lead to the many frightful incidents and scenes described in that part of English and Scottish history with which Presbyterianism is connected.

The general assembly in the expose of its motives for denying the validity of Catholic baptism, quotes neither Scripture, nor tradition, nor ecclesiastical history. Does it quote any thing? Yes: it quotes the *Presbyterian Directory*, the *Presbyterian form of government*, and the *minutes of Presbyterian assemblies*, and the *Presbyterian Digest;* an excellent mode of enlightening the world upon the question discussed, and of taking *papists* by surprise! As an improvement upon this method, we would suggest to ministers in general the convenient practice of quoting themselves; and instead of saying, We read in Scripture, to say, I have stated formerly, I have so taught, &c. But what is all this but recurring to the traditions of men which Protestants hold in execration? Do Presbyterians admit the infallibility of their Confession of Faith, Directory, and form of government? Certainly they do not, and hence they modify and amend their constitution as they please. Still, as inconsistency must show itself in some way or other, after having denied the tradition of the *universal* church, they are most admirably disposed tamely to submit to *Presbyterian tradition.*

It was scarcely to be imagined that the Presbyterians of America would revive in the nineteenth century an old and exploded heresy which, as every smatterer in divinity knows, was started, and condemned and crushed, though not without difficulty, in the first centuries of the church. The main, though perhaps not the only reason which is assigned in the minute quoted at the head of this article, is that a heretical church, which as they say is no church at all, can not validly administer baptism, and as we poor papists are rank and incor-

* Ch. 1. Art. v.

rigible heretics, there can be no virtue in our baptism. Now this constitutes precisely the error of the rebaptizers which had been given up by all sects as untenable, until in the year 1845 it pleased the Old School, otherwise Scotch, Presbyterians of the United States to renew it. Those who are ever so little acquainted with ecclesiastical history, know that this error originated with a certain Agrippinus, bishop of Carthage, towards the year 217. This bishop seems to have been well disposed, though perhaps of a weak mind. St. Vincent of Lerins, in his classical Monitory, No. 9, says of him: "Agrippinus of sacred memory, bishop of Carthage, was the first of mortals who against the divine law, against the rule of the universal church, against the opinion of all his colleagues in the priesthood, against the usage and decrees of the ancients, thought that heretics were to be re-baptized." The opinion of Agrippinus acquired greater notoriety a few years after, when St. Cyprian, in the same see of Carthage, towards the middle of the same century, adopting the views of his predecessors, ordered that all those who had been baptized by heretics should, on their re-entering the church, receive baptism anew. Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea, with some other bishops of Asia and Africa, had at the same time embraced the views of Cyprian, and the controversy then presented an example of a question which, because it was not clearly *settled* in the Scriptures, and because for a short time the universal practice of the church was not sufficiently known in some localities, was decided contradictorily, without any real schism or heresy, because the latter consists in an obstinate refusal to admit the decisions which the church, the ground and the pillar of truth, and always invisibly directed by the Holy Ghost, puts forth in relation to disputed points. St. Stephen, who was then seated in the pontifical chair, armed with the traditions of the church, whose custom it was, as transmitted from the apostles, not to re-baptize, and proving that this tradition, and not the fluctuating conclusions deduced by the human mind from some general and ambiguous sentences of Scripture, were to be the rule of Christians, vigorously opposed the views of the bishops, led astray by their precipitate and inconsiderate zeal, and addressed them in language which has ever since been engraven on the escutcheon of the church: "Let no innovation be made contrary to tradition."* Hence he concluded that those who return to the church from heresy, are not to be admitted by a second baptism, but by an expiatory ceremony of imposition of hands. It is not consistent with the limits of this article to enter into all the details of this interesting controversy; but it will be sufficient to state that the sure and practical method of tradition soon disposed of the innovation which had for a time crept into some portions of the church. Some years after we find the controversy ended by a solemn decision of the church, at the council of Arles in 314, in which many bishops from Africa, Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, and Gaul had assembled, together with two priests and two deacons sent by pope St. Sylvester. The decree runs thus: "Concerning Africans (who re-baptize, following their own way,) it has pleased the council that if any one returns to the church from heresy, and it be seen that he has been baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, he receive only imposition of hands; but if, on interrogating him, he does not answer to the Trinity, he must be baptized."† The great council of Nice, so much revered by all parties, decided the same controversy. For in the nineteenth canon it decrees that Paulinists must be re-baptized; and we learn from St. Augustine, St. Jerome, and Pope St. Innocent I, that these heretics vitiated the form of baptism, not invoking the three persons of the Holy Trinity. But in the eighth canon it decrees that the Cathari or Novatians were to be admitted by the imposition of hands. For these schismatics had preserved the usual form of baptism in the church. The second general council, held at Constantinople in the year 381, repeated in most express terms the same decrees. After these solemn decisions, the question of the validity of baptism given by heretical sects (provided they adhere to the matter and form prescribed by Christ) has always been considered in the church as a settled point, and all those who have obstinately maintained the opinion of the re-baptizers, have been looked upon as excluded from the church, as guilty of rebellion against her with whom Christ has pledged his word to remain until the consummation of ages. Such were the Donatists, a sect which

* Nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est.
† Can. 8.

arose in Africa towards the beginning of the fourth century, and taught that the ancient church had altogether perished, and a new one, perfectly pure, had arisen among themselves, though confined to Africa. In consequence of these notions, they re-baptized those who had not received baptism in their party, contending that no baptism was valid out of the church. The Donatists have always been noted as having joined heresy to schism, by their extravagant pretension that baptism was valid only in their own party. The full history and complete refutation of those sectarians is to be found in the works of St. Austin, who spent a great portion of his life in confuting their errors, and rendered his name illustrious and his memory precious to the church by his triumph over them. This celebrated doctor, whom Calvin himself and Calvinists generally praise and admire so much, established as a Christian axiom that sacraments are not null because they are conferred by wicked or heretical ministers. For the efficacy of a sacrament does not depend on the virtues and internal dispositions of the one who confers it; because it is Christ himself who applies the effect of the sacrament, through even an unworthy minister. The following words of this doctor can not be repeated too often, as they express in the clearest manner the views of the Christian church on the subject:

"Judas baptized and no one baptized again after him. John baptized, and such persons were baptized over again: because, even when Judas baptized, it was the baptism of Christ; but the other was the baptism of John. We do not prefer Judas to John; but we prefer the baptism of Christ given by Judas to the baptism of John given by himself, and thus it is Christ himself who has baptized those whom a drunkard, a murderer, an adulterer has baptized, if he has used the baptism of Christ; for I fear not a drunkard, a murderer, an adulterer, because I attend to the dove that says: He it is that baptizes."*

After the extinction of the Donatist schism, the error of the Rebaptizers fell into oblivion, until it was renewed by the Albigenses and the Valdenses, and afterwards by Wickliffe, who maintained the following proposition, which no one would now endorse: "If a bishop or a priest be in a state of mortal sin, he does not ordain, he does not consecrate, he does not baptize." The same heretic went so far as to deny the right of property in those who were in sin. His errors were anathematized by the church in the council of Constance, and such was the effect of these repeated condemnations of the error now revived by the Old School Presbyterians, that Luther and Calvin and the other patriarchs of the reformation never thought of questioning the validity of baptism conferred by heretics.* As a proof of this, we have only to state that the reformers, with the exception of the Anabaptists and Baptists, who, however, act on totally different grounds, have never rebaptized those who joined them either from the Catholic church or orther denominations. Indeed, the very fact that the Presbyterians gave a decision upon this point, is an evident proof of this: for, the case presenting itself often, there could be no reason for the new regulation, if a practice contrary to it did not already exist among them; in fact, their own Confession of Faith admits it clearly enough:† "The sacrament of baptism is but once to be administered to any person." This constitutes the text of the Confession of Faith, and as they bind themselves to follow Scripture as the only rule of faith and practice, here is the proof Presbyterians give of this non-repetition of baptism: "not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost. N. B.—There is no command, and no adequate example for the repetition of baptism."‡ How the text of St. Paul here quoted proves that baptism can not be administered more than once, is beyond our perception; but we find here an open and candid avowal of the Presbyterian church before the year 1845, that baptism can not be repeated. The Donatists and Rebaptizers in former days certainly afforded instances of the repetition of baptism, and are not these the instances which the *Confession* declares inadequate? If any thing more were required to stamp with the character of novelty this recent decision of the Presbyterians, it would be found in the counter report of the minority, who assert that the constant practice of the reformed churches has been to view Catholic baptism as valid, and in the avowal of the editor of the Presbyterian already quoted, who in-

* Tract v, in Joan.

* See Calvin's Institutes, l. iv, c. 1, s. 16.
† Ch. 28, Art. vii. ‡ Tit. iii, 5.

genuously confesses that the same decision could not have been obtained a year or two ago. As Presbyterians, then, have so far regarded our baptism as valid, we are led to infer that they have lately received some new inspiration, which directs them to consider it now as invalid. This forms but a trivial illustration of that constancy and permanency in belief which prevail among the opponents of the Catholic church. We do not despair of seeing the decision of the general assembly repealed at some future session, in order to exhibit still farther the inevitable necessity of self-constituted churches being tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine.

We think we have shown, with sufficient evidence, the unanimity of belief among the Christian churches concerning the validity of baptism given by heretics, and what we have said will place in its true light the following assertion of Prof. Thornwell:

"This question has been settled by at least five provincial councils, and always in the same way, viz: adverse to the recognition of such baptisms. We stand, therefore, upon the platform of the ancient church, and I hope this assembly will come unanimously upon the same ground."

Is not this a very edifying acknowledgment of the respect due to the ancient church; and who would not believe, after this, that Presbyterians revere traditions and ancient usages? But this pretended ancient church of the professor was in reality but an exceedingly small portion of the whole church; it was in reality neither more nor less than the church of Carthage, and of some other African and eastern cities, whose bishops, on the strength of a reasoning founded upon Scripture and upon an imperfect idea of the nature of sacraments, violated, as they themselves acknowledged, the custom of the ancient church. But that the ancient church was against the pretensions of modern Presbyterians is plain from the fact that she rose *en masse* against the advocates of rebaptization, and they were condemned, not by a few *provincial* councils, but by GENERAL councils, and the condemnation of these sectarians was acknowledged as a public and authentic fact, which the reformers themselves admitted, and which can be denied only by those who are willing to be ranked with ignorant and presumptuous sciolists. In fact, we can view the appeal of Professor Thornwell to the custom of the ancient church in no other light than as a trick of his to work upon the minds of the assembled preachers and elders, whom he knew full well to be better acquainted with pulpit platforms than with the platform of the ancient church, and to be much more conversant with the business of revival excitements, than with church history and ecclesiastical antiquities.

We have not to do, however, with the declamations of the orators who figured in the assembly, but with the minute adopted and sanctioned by the majority of that body. From the preceding historical sketch, the reader will be better able to appreciate the course of reasoning presented to the world by the Old School general assembly in support of the decision against the validity of baptism in the church of Rome. They say:

"Since baptism is an ordinance established by Christ in his church,* and is to be administered only by a minister of Christ, duly called and ordained to be a steward of the mysteries of God,† it follows that no rite administered by one who is not himself a duly ordained minister of the true church of God visible, can be regarded as an ordinance of Christ, whatever be the name by which it is called, whatever the form employed in its administration; the so called priests of the Romish communion are not ministers of Christ."

Most of the minute is taken up in maintaining the assertions contained in this extract, which we may sum up and divide into three propositions. None but a duly ordained minister can confer baptism validly; a false church can have no duly ordained ministers; the Roman church is a false church. From these three propositions we arrive at the conclusion that the church of Rome has no valid baptism. The real scope of the argument contained in the minute is to expose the last proposition, that the church of Rome is no true church, but an apostate one, the man of sin, accursed of God, and, more than all this, she was declared to be no church by an anathema passed against her as late as the general assembly of 1835. Now it is easy to show that the three propositions above enumerated are absolutely and unqualifiedly false, not only according to our own principles, or the decrees of our church, which, by reason of its superior authority, and other prerogatives, should at least

* Form. Gov., ch. vii, Matt. xxviii, 19, 20.
† Directory, ch. vii, § 1.

outweigh the decision of the hundred and eighty-nine Presbyterian divines (this requires no proof), but according to the principles of the reformers themselves; and we promise to convince the reader not only that the general assembly were ignorant of the Catholic doctrine, but that they equally misunderstood the doctrine delivered by the authors, and generally adopted by the abettors of the reformation.

1. "None but a duly ordained minister can confer baptism validly." This first proposition is utterly false. Let us hear Luther upon this subject; his authority should have great weight; for, according to the minute adopted by the assembly, "Luther and his coadjutors were fully authorized by the word of God to ordain successors in the ministry, and so to extend and perpetuate the reformed churches;" or, in other words, Luther was the grand-sire even of the Presbyterian church, and he was raised up by the Almighty for its establishment and propagation. Now Luther, so far from requiring a duly ordained minister to confer baptism validly, admitted as valid the baptism of any body, man, woman, or child; nay, even baptism given by the devil himself. Lest the reader imagine this to be a mere joke, we quote the following from Luther's book "on the private mass and the unction of priests," published in the year 1534. "I will not say what papists say, that no angel, nor Mary herself, could consecrate. But on the contrary, I say that if the devil himself would come, and that I afterwards knew that the devil had crept into the office of a pastor of the church in the shape of a man, and had preached, baptized, celebrated mass, and absolved from sin, following the institution of Christ, then we would be bound to own that sacraments are not on that account devoid of efficacy, and that Christians would have received a true baptism, a true Gospel, a true absolution, and a true sacrament of the body and blood of Christ." After having made this assertion, Luther adduces proofs from Scripture and other sources to establish it. We will not follow him in this discussion; but we think it due to the reformer's reputation of consistency to add that one of his favorite theories, broached by him to meet the difficulties arising from peculiar circumstances of Protestantism, consisted in asserting that all baptized Christians are ministers of the church, or priests, and have full power to preach, baptize, absolve, &c. It would be too long to enumerate the passages of Luther's work, in which he maintains this doctrine; it will suffice to quote one of his books, written for this very purpose in 1523: *Ad Pragenses de instituendis ministris.* He here asserts that "no one is *made* priest of the New Testament, but a priest is *born* so; no priest is *ordained*, but he is so *created*. He is born a priest in baptism, and all Christians are priests." After this he undertakes to prove at length that all Christians receive in baptism the right of preaching, baptizing, absolving, and binding. According to Luther, therefore, all Christians are duly ordained ministers, and are empowered to confer all sacraments validly. It is true, Calvin thought far otherwise, and he was so much opposed to Luther's sentiment, that all Christians are equal in the administration of the sacraments, that he denies to laymen, and particularly to women, the right of baptizing in case of necessity, though the contrary, in regard to baptism, had been admitted from the earliest ages, both in the western and eastern churches. Luther and Calvin differ on this point as on many others, yet both present us the Bible as a warrant for the truth of their assertion. Does the Bible teach such contradictions? The only way to explain this moral phenomenon is to suppose that neither found his doctrine in the Bible, but in his own imagination; it is also plain that neither Luther nor Calvin was divinely appointed for the reformation of the church, but unfortunately misled into the ways of schism and error.

The true doctrine which had always been taught before the sixteenth century, recognises in laymen the power of baptizing validly; a power which they may and should make use of in case of necessity; this case excepted, the authority to administer the sacraments belongs only to duly ordained ministers. It is well, indeed, for Presbyterians that laymen can validly administer baptism, otherwise their baptism would be evidently null, for their ministers themselves are mere laymen according to their own showing. We would not make this remark but for the strange declaration of the minute,

"That Luther and his coadjutors, being duly ordained presbyters at the time when they left the Romish communion, were fully authorized to ordain successors in the ministry."

Laying aside the fact, ascertained by the constant doctrine and practice of the church, that presbyters have no right to ordain others, do Presbyterians forget that they never received any orders from Luther, and that they are the offspring of Calvin, who was not even a *presbyter*, and who, therefore, by their own confession, had no right to ordain ministers? "Out of your own mouth we judge you." The one hundred and eighty-nine voters seem to have lost sight of their own history.

2. The second proposition mentioned above is also utterly inadmissible, that *a false church can have no duly ordained ministers.* We need only advert to the fact that the whole Christian world, with the exception of the Donatists already referred to, have always believed that a duly ordained ministry could exist in a false church. Hence the Catholic church in ancient times never raised a doubt upon the validity of ordinations among Arians and Pelagians, nor does the church at present deny the validity of Greek ordinations, though she looks upon the Greek church as a schismatical body. But we would ask, how do Presbyterians prove their point from Scripture in opposition to tradition and to the Christian world, which, with the Scripture always under their eyes, never perceived in it the doctrine of Presbyterians? The same argument that is adduced against the possibility of a valid ministry in a false church, may, with equal reason, be alleged against the possibility of any false church possessing the genuine word of God or the Scriptures. But we invite the attention of our Presbyterian friends to the following dilemma, from which we see not how they can extricate themselves. At the time that Luther and Calvin separated from the Roman church, the latter was either a true or a false church. If she was a false church, then Calvin, whom all admit to have been baptized in her communion, did not receive a valid baptism, then neither he nor his followers were baptized, and, of course, the body of Presbyterians at this day, in regard to the Christian church, are like the *uncircumcised Philistines* of old, since there has never been a duly ordained minister among them. If the Roman church was a true church, then Calvin and his followers should never have abandoned it: by separating themselves from it, they have incurred the guilt of schism, which has excluded them from the true church, and for this reason again they have no duly ordained minister. It is plain, therefore, that Presbyterians, by their decision, have set a trap in which they have been caught themselves first.

3. The third assertion to which we have alluded declares that *the Roman church is a false church.* Now, setting aside in this assertion the hostile spirit, the presumption, pride, and infatuation which it bears upon the face of it, we shall speak only of the plain inconsistency and contradiction of the Scotch Presbyterian party. For they here abandon the only plank left to Protestants for upholding the appearance of a church system, and they depart from the common doctrine held by their most eminent and celebrated divines. Jurieu was as stern a Calvinist and Presbyterian as any member of the Cincinnati assembly, and yet, in his investigation of the subject, in order to hold out a little longer in the controversial field, he was driven to the system of the *fundamental articles* of Christianity, which contends that only those societies that deny some fundamental points are excluded from the universal church. Now Jurieu himself, as infuriated against papal Rome as any member of the recent assembly, had not the boldness to say that the Roman church erred in any fundamental article, because he had a little more judgment and tact than our Old School Presbyterians. Jurieu excluded Unitarians from the true church, while he admitted Catholics, although with reluctance. All Protestant societies have been of the same sentiment, and thus has arisen that system of latitudinarianism which has engulfed all the reformed churches of Germany, England, and even America, if we except the rigid Presbyterians, the true descendants of Knox, who have not yet felt what is termed "the mild influence of this refined and tolerant age."*

* The New School Presbyterians are in this respect totally at variance with their former brethren. Besides their repudiation of the harsh dogmas of Calvin concerning predestination, fatalism, and the redemption of only a few, they adopt in its widest sense the idea of a church consisting of all sects. The author of an article on the New School Presbyterians, found in the "original history of the religious denominations in the United States," says in reference to this branch of the Presbyterian church: "It does not regard itself as *the* church, but only as a particular branch of the Catholic or universal church. It regards papacy and episcopacy as great usurpations of ecclesiastical power. . . . Yet Presbyterians do not deny the validity of ordinances, because mixed with the errors and usurpations of prelacy. On the contrary they dare not disown any church which holds Christ the head."

On one condition, however, the O. S. Presbyterians would view us as genuine Christians; in case the Catholic church would adopt the views of Ronge, the apostate priest who wishes to cover with the cloak of religious hypocrisy his lewdness, insubordination, and pride. An argument deduced from the conduct of Ronge to prove our claims to orthodoxy was adduced by certain orators in the assembly, and seemed to make some impression. This is certainly latitude enough. To acquire the honor of being reputed orthodox in faith and high in sanctity, we have only to imitate Lucifer, who, in his pride, would submit to nobody, not even to God, and to imitate those deluded widows of whom the apostle speaks: "When they have grown wanton in Christ, they will marry, having damnation because they have made void their first faith."* It will be a long time before the Presbyterians admit us to the right of church membership on such grounds. Ronge, Chatel, Gregoire, &c., will soon fall into that oblivion and neglect from which they should never have risen, and the Catholic church will ride through the storm as triumphantly as ever. Her whole history authorizes this assertion.

The minute, however, sets forth some of the principal reasons which prevent the Roman church from being a true church.

"She claims to be infallible—she claims equal authority for the Apocrypha as for the New Testament—she declares the sense held and taught by holy mother church on the authority of the fathers and tradition, to be the true and only sense of Scripture—she rejects the justification by faith—she proclaims the reception of the eucharist to be the receiving of Christ himself."

These are the fundamental errors attributed to the church of Rome, and for which, in the opinion of the Scotch party, she is no church at all. A word will suffice on each of these charges. *She claims to be infallible.* On this ground the Presbyterian church is also no church, for she practically asserted and vindicated her infallibility by excluding, in 1837 and 1838, from the general assembly, nearly one half of the old Presbyterian church on account of sixteen doctrinal errors, besides ten departures from Presbyterian order, and five declensions in Christian discipline. Such were the grounds of the verdict rendered by the old against the new school. *She claims authority for the Apocrypha as for the New Testament.* On this score St. Matthew himself, who quotes, ch. xxvii, v. 43, from the Book of Wisdom, ii, 13, was not in the church, and the great council of Nice, convened from every part of Christianity in 325, was not in the church, because it placed the Book of Judith among the sacred Scriptures, as we learn from St. Jerom in his preface on this book. *She declares the sense held and taught by holy mother church on the authority of the fathers and tradition to be the true and only sense of Scripture.* This is, indeed, a singular charge; it might as well be made a fundamental error to use words in the sense that most people and most dictionaries give to them. But why do the Presbyterians fall themselves into the pretended abuse which they reproach us with? Why do they give their disciples, besides the Old and New Testament, *the Confession of Faith* of the Presbyterian church, and the *Larger* and *Shorter Catechisms* of the Westminster assembly?* At all events, if Scripture is to be interpreted by every one as he pleases, we still come within the limits of Protestant orthodoxy by *choosing* to interpret it as so many others have done before us. *She rejects justification by faith.* This is utterly false: we reject justification by faith *alone.* We do not attribute a physical effect to sacraments by which they sanctify a man necessarily, whether he has faith, sorrow for his sins, or not, as some of the orators of the assembly seem to have understood it. Moreover, we hold in abhorrence the maxim of Luther, who advised his followers to sin boldly, that they might test more fully the success of justification by *faith alone.* *She proclaims the reception of the eucharist to be the receiving of Christ himself.* If this is a fundamental error, the Lutherans, who in Europe and in this country form a number far exceeding the other branches of Protestantism, are also excluded from the church.

Thus, according to principles laid down by the divines of Cincinnati, the New School Presbyterians are not in the church, having been cut off for schism and heresy in 1839. The Lutherans are not in the church; the church of England is almost ruined, and one half of it is entirely ruined by admitting tradition and the real presence, and thus, by a

* 1 Tim. iv, 12.

* Direct. ch. vii, § 4.

grand discovery, the Christian church is reduced very nearly to the Old School Presbyterians, consisting of about fourteen hundred ministers, with two hundred thousand members in communion. They form the kingdom of Christ upon earth. Such being the case, the following passages of Scripture concerning the universal diffusion of the church of Christ, may not be inaptly suggested for the examination and serious study of our Presbyterian divines. We will remark in advance that they are not taken from the Apocrypha.* "Ask of me, and I will give thee the gentiles for thy inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession."† "He shall rule from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth."‡ "All the nations thou hast made shall come and adore before thee."§ "The stone cut out of a mountain became itself a great mountain, filling the whole earth."‖ "In the last days the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be prepared on the top of mountains, and all nations shall flow unto it." In short, let our opponents reflect upon the grain of mustard seed which became a great tree, spreading its branches on every side, and upon the promise, *go teach all nations: I am with you all days*, &c. The small number of Old School Presbyterians will perhaps open their eyes, and see that they do not fill the whole earth, but are confined to a very small corner of the globe. The Roman Catholic church alone beholds all these prophecies verified in her universal diffusion, and she alone is free from the necessity of having recourse to the ruinous and antichristian theory of the *fundamental articles* in order to explain the Catholicity of the kingdom of Christ upon earth.

Before we dismiss this third assertion of the general assembly we have one more remark to make. If the Catholic church is a false church for holding the doctrines above enumerated, she was then a false church at the period when Luther, Calvin, Knox, and other reformers were born. For it is manifest that she held then the doctrines rejected by Presbyterians. The church then claimed infallibility, the so-called Apocrypha were in all editions of the Bible; tradition was revered, and the holy eucharist was held without a dissenting voice to be the body of Christ. That the church then professed these doctrines can be proved from innumerable monuments anterior to the rise of Protestantism, and indeed from the consent both of Catholics and Protestants. The former acknowledge that no change can occur in the faith, and the latter urge the profession of those doctrines as a ground for instituting a new religion. The church, then, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, admitted all those doctrines which are so unpalatable to Presbyterians, and, if the profession of these doctrines constitutes a false church, Calvin and his coadjutors who received baptism in the Roman Catholic church, and were not afterwards re-baptized, received baptism in a false church. Then, according to the principles of the O. S. Presbyterians, they were not baptized, and as an immediate and necessary consequence of the New Presbyterian theory of baptism, the Presbyterians of our days are not baptized. Consequently the Presbyterians of Cincinnati have proved the invalidity of no baptism but their own, they have thrown stones into the air which in falling have crushed themselves.

We have so far disposed of the principal argument in the minute of the Presbyterian assembly, and the reader has no doubt found it burthened with as many absurdities, contradictions and inconsistencies as could be well served up in a paper of only a few lines. But the O. S. Presbyterian divines, mistrusting the slippery ground on which they stood with the Donatists and other rebaptizers, ventured to add other reasons explanatory of their solemn decision. These reasons are unconnected with the former, and remind us of the argument of the wolf with the lamb. The lamb, he said, had disturbed the water which he was drinking, but this being found unavailable, the lamb was charged with having slandered the wolf on a former occasion.

The incidental pretext urged against the validity of our baptism is expressed in the following words of the minute:

"Further, by the perverted meaning they affix, and the superstitious rites they have superadded to the ceremonies they perform under the name of baptism and the eucharist, the symbolical nature and true design of both the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper, are lost sight of and utterly destroyed; so that,

* Ps. xi, 3. † Ib. lxxi, 8. ‡ Ib. lxxxv, 9.
§ Dan. ii, 35. ‖ Isai. xi, 2.

could we, by any possibility, assign to her the *name of a church*, she would still be a church without the grand ordinances of the Gospel."

This pretext may seem obscure and vague, but, with the aid of a commentary, we will perhaps discover the meaning of the learned divines. Of the eucharist we shall say nothing, because this is not the question before us. Of course if we have no baptism we have no eucharist, but the reverse is manifestly absurd; for a Presbyterian would not say that the baptism of a Presbyterian infant is invalid because the eucharist has not yet been administered. But what are the superstitious rites which we have superadded to the ceremonies we perform under the name of baptism? What is the perverted meaning we affix to baptism? How do we destroy the symbolical nature of baptism? These queries will be best solved by the orators of the assembly whose views were embodied in its minute. Prof. Thornwell has the floor.

"Rome baptizes not with water, but with a mixture of oil and water made by the priest, and (her baptism) is, therefore, defective in the matter of it. Again, Romish baptisms are defective in the form. They are not performed in the name of the Trinity as recognising the personal relations of the three persons in the Godhead. Though it may seem startling, I think I can show the Romish church has no sacraments. I believe that *symbolical* character is necessary to the nature of a sacrament. Rome has wholly dispensed with this, and teaches that sacraments give grace."

The vague charges of the assembly become quite intelligible with the aid of the professor's lucid explanations. The baptism of Rome is not valid, because, "1. Rome uses a mixture of oil and water. 2. She destroys the form of baptism. 3. She looks upon baptism, not as a symbol, but as a cause of grace. These charges have the merit of originality. So far no one had raised a suspicion that baptism was vitiated among us by such causes. 1. It is true that the church has from the remotest antiquity prescribed an unction of the water used in baptism. But is true, likewise, that only a few drops of oil are thus used in a large quantity of water, and it is chemically true, also, that oil and water possess no perceptible degree of affinity, so that the water is at no time identified with oil, and, therefore, Catholic priests baptize, not with oil, but with water. After this nice display of criticism, which the Pharisees of old, who strained at a gnat and swallowed the camel, would have had no reason to be ashamed of, we naturally looked for some remarks on the degree of purity in the water used for Presbyterian baptism. What *per centum* of chloride of sodium, or sulphate of lime, would invalidate baptism? For all water found upon the surface of the earth contains some impurity. Why did not our punctilious theologians decide whether we are to make use of distilled water, or of rain water as most free from oil and foreign substances? They have left us altogether in the dark on these interesting topics. We shall take the liberty, then, of reminding them that Luther, whom they recognise in the minute as the fountain-head of the *valid* sacraments which they possess, was not quite so scrupulous as they seem to be: for Luther very graciously, though somewhat reluctantly, admitted the validity of baptism administered with wine.* It does not follow from this, however, that he was a toper.

2. The second charge against the validity of the form used in our baptism altogether exceeds our comprehension. Even after having read in the *Confession of Faith* the definition of the Trinity, and in the Directory,† the words used by Presbyterians in administering baptism, we could obtain no satisfactory meaning of the charge; for we use the same form there laid down, or rather the Presbyterians have borrowed this form from us. Why that form should be invalid in the mouth of a priest which is valid in the mouth of a Presbyterian, is to us perfectly unintelligible.

3. The third charge, that our baptism is null, because we administer it not as a sign, but as a cause of grace, is interesting enough. In the belief of a Presbyterian, a sacrament must be a sign and nothing else. Sacraments must be signs of nothing, like the notes of insolvent banks. We do not believe that Christ ever thought of instituting such empty signs. This discussion, however, has nothing to do with the validity of baptism. All that we have to do, is to use the sign instituted by Christ, without any reference to the peculiar views or purposes of the one who confers the sacrament. We will here take the liberty of referring the Presbyterian divines to their own Confession of

* See the seventeenth chapter of his most edifying work, *Table Talk*. † Ch. vii, § 5.

Faith, which they certainly lost sight of in their charge against the Catholic church.* "The grace which is exhibited in, or by the sacraments, rightly used, is not conferred by any power in them; neither doth the efficacy of a sacrament depend upon the piety or intention of him that doth administer it, but upon the work of the spirit and the word of institution."† From these words of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, it is evident that it matters little what I *intend* to do with the baptism, or what extension or restriction I may have in my mind as to the effect of the rite; provided I use the proper rite with the words ordained by Christ, I confer the sacrament validly. Is it not a little strange that Presbyterian doctors should be ignorant of their own tenets? They prate to us about the ritual of the Catholic church and the council of Trent; but, from what has been said, it is plain enough that they should first undertake to explain and justify their own formulas. Be this as it may, the following consideration will show Professor Thornwell's three great reasons to be altogether inadmissible. Luther, Calvin, and Knox were all baptized in the Catholic church, and not re-baptized afterwards. They were then baptized with water mixed with oil, according to the form used in our days; and they were baptized by priests who intended to do what we do still. Therefore, their baptism was not valid, if ours is not valid, and consequently the authors of the reformation were not Christians, and, according to the theory of our opponents, the Old School Presbyterian church has no ministry, no baptism. In this way they have essentially unchurched themselves, and themselves alone, by their late decision.‡

We now come to an examination of the last argument on which the minute of the assembly grounds its rejection of Catholic baptism. It abounds still more in absurdity and contradiction than the reasonings which we have already noticed, and it will therefore constitute in this discussion what the French call *la bonne bouche.* The minute says:

"Moreover, since by the eleventh canon of the council of Trent, she (the Catholic church) declares the efficacy of her ordinances to depend upon the intention of the administrator, no man can know with certainty that her form of administration in any ordinance is not a mere mockery. No consistent papist can be certain that he has been duly baptized... The papal hierarchy has by her own solemn acts shrouded all her doings in uncertainty, and enveloped all her rites in hopeless obscurity. Even on this ground alone the validity of her baptism might safely be denied."

The "eleventh canon of the council," that is to say, the eleventh canon of the seventh session, alludes, in these words, to the intention of the minister who confers the sacrament:

"If any one says that it is not required for ministers, whilst administering the sacraments, to have at least the intention of doing what the church does, let him be anathema."

The council, it is true, requires a certain intention in the minister of the sacrament. But can the general assembly forget that they also require an intention? How could they be guilty of so glaring a contradiction in the course of a few lines? Do they not require, under pain of nullity in the administration of baptism, the intention of using a mere symbol, or in other words, the intention of doing *nothing?* And lo! they tell us that our baptism is invalid, because we require, in the administration of the rite, an intention of doing *something!* But let us see what intention is required by the council, and examine how far we are left uncertain as to the validity of our baptism. The opinion which the council cen-

* Ch. 27, § 3.

† The *Confession of Faith*, as usual, produces Scriptural authority on this head: Rom. ii, 28, 29, "for he is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward on the flesh: but he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God." Now, how does this text prove that the efficacy of a sacrament does not depend upon the piety or intention of him who administers it? The Presbyterian ritual is full of such texts, which prove about as much as the one just quoted: yet to the unlearned it seems to contain an armory of Scripture authority. In reality, however, it is nothing else than throwing dust into people's eyes. Any one that has ever studied logic, or a few propositions of Euclid, will smile at the pretended Scripture proofs of Presbyterians. In our opinion, the best argument for the necessity of tradition, is the utter failure of our opponents in concocting a system of religion from such scattered quotations.

‡ That they unchurched themselves, will not appear very surprising to those who reflect upon the subject. But it is amazing indeed that they should presume to unchurch others, when they acknowledge among themselves so deplorable a dearth of heavenly influences. The divine aid is specially needed on an occasion like the one referred to: yet we find the following announcement in the Presbyterian journals:

"The Presbyterian general assembly has recommended the observance of the Thursday before the fourth Sabbath of June as a day of fast and prayer, in view of the present suspension of divine influences among the churches."

Query: Was it not this suspension of divine influences that led our Presbyterian divines out of their way?—Ed.

sures, in the above quoted passage, is that of Luther, who contended that baptism was good even when made a jest of; for instance, when performed in mockery by a comedian. The council condemns this opinion, and requires in the minister the intention of doing something religious in general, that is, the intention at least of doing what is reputed a religious rite in the church of God. In this way are the sacraments universally understood; and assuredly, if a Presbyterian minister, without any intention of baptizing, happened to wash his child in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, in consequence of a habit which he had acquired of performing actions for the glory of God, he would not, we presume, look upon the baptism as validly administered. The council rejects a sacrament conferred only physically, without any intention; it requires the intention of seriously performing a rite reputed religious among Christians.* What uncertainty can hence arise in the mind of a Catholic? Who would ever suspect that he was baptized by a minister who was either jesting or asleep at the time, the more so, as the council does not require in the minister a belief that he does something useful, but merely the intention of performing seriously, and not in jest, the religious ceremony called baptism? How could the thought enter the mind of a Catholic that he was baptized fortuitously, or at random, without any intention on the part of the minister, if he knows that he was baptized in a church, and in the usual way? In such a case there could be no more reason for uncertainty, than there would be to fear lest the minister had used alcohol, or some other colorless liquid, instead of water. But passing strange is the declaration of the assembly, that "on this ground alone the validity of Catholic baptism may be denied." Our divines should have arrived at the very opposite conclusion. They censure the council for requiring an intention, and they maintain that this intention is not required; it follows, therefore, that baptism is valid even in those cases in which the intention required by the council is wanting. In their zeal to find our baptism invalid, they have adopted premises which prove just the reverse. It would be equally illogical to say: in a few cases baptism may be null for the want of intention in the minister, therefore *all* Catholic baptisms are null. The true conclusion would be that baptism is valid, except in those few cases where the intention is wanting. In short, if we are to admit this vague reasoning, founded upon a want of intention in the minister, which after all is very improbable, it would follow that the baptism of Luther and Calvin was subject to the same uncertainty, and therefore neither Calvin nor his followers are baptized, according to their own showing. From all this it is plain that there is not a shadow of argument in the minute adopted by the Presbyterian assembly; whatever weapons they aim at us must first pass through Luther and Calvin, and give a death blow to Presbyterianism in the person of its apostles and founders.

In conclusion, we may remark that this question of the validity of Catholic baptism has no practical interest or bearing whatever, according to the principles of Presbyterians. Whether our baptism be valid or not, whether Catholic children be validly or invalidly baptized, is a point which, according to their theology, does not in the least affect their happiness. If these infants belong to the number of the predestined, they will be saved whether they receive a valid or invalid baptism, or no baptism at all; if they happen to be of the number of the reprobate, no baptism, however valid, will be of any service to them. In all cases baptism for them amounts to nothing. This is the Presbyterian doctrine, which is held and advocated with the utmost tenacity, particularly among the members of the Old School, who have succeeded in ejecting from their society such of their brethren

* From the fact that Calvinists, in conferring baptism, have not the intention of producing its real effects, as we have seen above, the Catholic may perhaps infer that their baptism is invalid from the want of intention on the part of the minister. But this conclusion would be incorrect, as all theologians teach, after an express decision of Pope Pius V on this subject. This decision is grounded upon the following reason: that whatever may be their views concerning the effects of baptism, their predominant intention is to administer the religious rite which among Christians is known under that name. Catholics are aware that, when we re-baptize Protestants who embrace the true faith, we do it *conditionally;* that is, we have no doubt as to the validity of their baptism if properly administered, but it being frequently uncertain whether the ceremony has been performed with the right matter and form, we repeat it *conditionally.* The uncertainty alluded to arises from the circumstance that many Protestant ministers do not consider baptism necessary for salvation, or pay little attention to the requisite method of administering it.

who entertained more liberal views, and were less tainted with fatalism. The validity or invalidity of baptism, in the mouth of the Old School Presbyterians, is, therefore, an idle question altogether, though it was judiciously selected as an exciting occasion of slander and abuse against the Catholic church. For those who took part in the debate, it could not fail to be a fruitful source of calumny and misrepresentation, and accordingly we have seen the reverend divines pouring forth their rancor against the most ancient and the most numerous portion of Christendom with an extraordinary profusion. It has happened, however, quite contrary to their expectations, that in emitting their venom they wounded themselves, not only by involving their own baptism in the attempted ruin of the Catholic rite, but also by the moral effect which the contradictions, false reasonings, inconsistencies, and absurdities of every kind, with which their document abounds, must necessarily have upon the minds of thinking men.

The course pursued by the Old School Presbyterians is the very thing to render their sec unpopular, and to justify more fully the title of gloomy heresy with which it was hailed at its entrance into the world. They begin, it seems, to be afraid of their solitude; they complain of the low state of religion; they witness with no little mortification the "suspension of divine influences" in their society, and then fast in order to obtain a revival of religion. Well may they do this. Better will it be if they resort to this salutary practice more frequently, not only once a year, but every week, and even every day; and if they do not succeed in removing the spiritual drought that they complain of, they will at least cast off that spirit of bitterness, and anti-christian feeling, which is no small hindrance in the way of peace and salvation.

GREGORY THE SEVENTH AND HIS AGE.

Gregory the Seventh and his Age. North American Review. July, 1845. Boston.

THIS is the title of a spirited article in the publication just referred to. Though it contains several inaccuracies to which we shall call the attention of the reader, it does honor both to the mind and the heart of the author, inasmuch as he has proved himself capable of appreciating, better than a host of other writers, the noble exertions of a sainted pope in the cause of order and morality, and appears, moreover, to feel a lively interest in those struggles and sufferings through which his pen has traced the career of the venerated pontiff. The style of the reviewer is in unison with his feelings, lofty, animated and picturesque.

His article, however, is far from being unexceptionable. There are several errors in it, which, although not imputable to any bigotry or insincerity on the part of the author, but rather to the want of the necessary means of information, are not the less important or deserving of notice. We see not, for instance, any ground for the assertion that during the middle ages there was any thing like the "nasal twang of priestly insult to God;" and most probably the writer has no clear idea of it himself. We regret likewise that he has dwelt so long on the disorders of that remote period, (though he mentions only particular facts,) leaving his reader under the impression that all was then vice and corruption. This is manifestly incorrect.

There was, indeed, much evil in those times, as there always has been, and always will be while men continue upon earth; but there was a vast deal of good also: a lively faith, a sincere attachment to religion, an ardent devotion, were often visible in those days: there flourished many holy popes and bishops, priests and religious; piety had numerous votaries among princes as well as among the

laity, and a large number of useful institutions and communities, as those of Cluny, Camaldoli, &c., sprung into existence. The evil itself, however great it may have been at any time, was far from being derogatory to the Catholic church; on the contrary it served only to show forth her inviolable sanctity, by the unceasing efforts which it elicited for the arresting and suppression of disorder. This is so clear a point that the reviewer himself admits it, and we have merely to quote his own words.

"Though seemingly enslaved, the church was in reality the life of Europe. She was the refuge of the distressed, the friend of the slave, the helper of the injured, the only hope of learning. To her, chivalry owed its noble aspirations; to her, art and agriculture looked for every improvement. The ruler from her learned some rude justice; the ruled learned faith and obedience. Let us not cling to the superstition which teaches that the church has always upheld the cause of tyrants. Through the middle ages she was the only friend and advocate of the people, and of the rights of man. To her influence was it owing that, through all that strange era, the slaves of Europe were better protected by law than are now the free blacks of our United States by the national statutes."—P. 26.

Thus did the Catholic church incessantly oppose herself to tyranny, oppression, vice and immorality, and prove herself the advocate of truth, right, and justice, and of every thing conducive to man's happiness. How could it have been otherwise? How could the church have been unfaithful to her divine commission, and become disfigured by corruption, error, and superstition?

"Did Jesus come in vain? Did Peter found his holy see in vain? Had God deserted that church with which he promised to be while the world stood? God had not deserted it; it needed an effort on man's part; it needed self-sacrifice and courage," etc.—P. 31.

The reviewer, it is true, awards no credit to the Roman church for these first efforts in the cause of humanity and civilization; and in this, we are sorry to say, he evinces but little acquaintance with the history of the past. Besides the holy popes of primitive times, the Innocents, the Leos, the Gregories, how many others could he have discovered, even in the middle ages and prior to the pontificate of Gregory the seventh, who were equally zealous for the interests of religion, for the reformation of morals among the people, and for their own advancement in virtue; such as Benedict IV, Leo VII, Stephen IX, Martin III, Agapet II, Sylvester II, etc. The *truce of God* itself, that excellent institution of the eleventh century, the merit of which he gives exclusively to the bishops of Spain and France, derived its principal efficacy from the solemn sanction which it received from Pope Urban II in the council of Clermont.

But the reviewer not only maintains this incorrect notion; he carries it to the very last extreme. According to him, "the church was not yet a hierarchy, but rather an aristocracy." It was the monk Hildebrand (afterward Pope Gregory the Seventh) who determined that "it should lose its independent, feudal, aristocratic character; that it should be one, and Rome its efficient head!" What! had not the church of God, before that epoch and from the first moment of her existence, been essentially one? had not the successor of St. Peter in the see of Rome been always the efficient head of Christendom! Wonderful indeed, if this had not been the case, and still more wonderful, nay, altogether incredible would it be, that under such circumstances Gregory the seventh could have succeeded in carrying out his views, with every odds against him and in opposition to the most violent passions of man.

Moreover, how can the reviewer reconcile this his favorite hypothesis with the facts which he himself admits, viz: the universal interest awakened by the election of the Roman pontiff; the persevering efforts of the German emperors to maintain it under their control; the titles and prerogatives enjoyed by the bishop of Rome, who was styled and considered the successor of St. Peter, the father of the church, the head of Christendom, the chief of bishops; and was appealed to and heard by kings and emperors as the highest authority upon earth? All these facts occurred as well before as after the pontificate of Gregory the seventh. Hence it is unnecessary for us to adduce the writings of St. Irenæus, St. Cyprian, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, and the acts or decrees of the ancient and celebrated councils of Chalcedon, Ephesus, Nice, and Sardica, in order to show that the unity of the church and the spiritual supremacy of the Roman pontiff were always both dogmatically and practically admitted: the contrary system of the reviewer carries along with it its own refutation, and shows itself at once,

not only destitute of all probability and proof, but directly opposed to facts and to the monuments of history.

As to that assumption of temperal power over kings and emperors with which Gregory the seventh is so often charged, we will readily understand the subject with the aid of a distinction: either the question relates to a direct temporal power, which disposes of kingdoms and empires at pleasure, or it regards an indirect power, in virtue of which the pastors of the church employed their own sacred authority, for the purpose of compelling Christian princes to do their duty, and not to tyrannize over their subjects. In this latter case we freely admit the Roman pontiffs did exercise power over kings and princes, and we deem it highly honorable to them that they did so; but in the former hypothesis the charge is manifestly unjust, for neither Gregory VII nor any other pope ever ventured upon a direct temporal power, such as that alluded to above. Of the indirect power we have many instances. Long before the middle ages, Philip, the Christian emperor of the east, was denied entrance into the church and subjected to a public penance, in expiation of the murder of his predecessor; Theodosius, also, remained for eight months under a sentence of excommunication, for the slaughter of Thessalonica, and was compelled to pass a law which would in future secure him against the promptings of sudden anger; at a later period the Emperor Mauritius was obliged by the rigorous remonstrances of Gregory the great, to repeal, or at least to modify a statute of pernicious tendency. This indirect temporal power was, it is true, exercised during the middle ages, to a much greater extent, and sometimes, though very seldom, it extended to a sentence of deposition against wicked and profligate princes. But it should be observed that this extraordinary measure was allowed by the general jurisprudence of the age, and required by the stern necessity of circumstances; that there was no other way of saving the people from oppression, and the most sacred laws from violation; that it was resorted to, only after all other means had been employed in vain, and against those sovereigns only whose elevation to the throne depended, more or less, on the free and conditional choice of their subjects.

Is Gregory VII, or any other pope, to be censured under such circumstances, or rather not to be highly extolled for having used the authority which Divine Providence had expressly committed to him for the preservation of the church, and the guardianship of religion, civilization and morality? If this is pride or despotism, as the reviewer, notwithstanding his usual tone of moderation, occasionally thinks proper to call it, it must be admitted at least that it is a noble despotism; that despotism of truth over error, of virtue over vice, of moral power over barbarism and licentiousness; a despotism which is daily exercised, with a due regard to circumstances, by a good father, for the maintenance of order in his family, by a good magistrate for the repression of lawless violence, and by a good ruler for the happiness and tranquillity of his people.

We shall notice but one more error in the article under consideration;—we allude to the unjust suspicions cast upon the purity of Gregory the seventh's motives both before and at the time of his election to the popedom. How can that man be accused of ambition, who by his powerful influence determined the election of five successive popes, and never did any thing to bend the scale in his own favor? How can he be in the least suspected of hypocrisy, when he is known to have resisted his own promotion as long and as effectually as he could, even so far as to urge the intervention of Henry IV, emperor of Germany, whose disorders he declared himself resolved not to tolerate, in the event of his being elected to the papacy? It is impossible to account for Gregory's conduct on this occasion, except by the supposition of a sincere humility on his part which led him to dread the sublime and eminently responsible office of the supremacy, and to believe that many other persons were better qualified for the station than himself. When he perceived, in the unanimous suffrages of the Roman clergy, an evident expression of the divine will in his regard, he no longer resisted, but armed himself with an invincible courage to fight the battle of the Lord against the prevalent vices of the age, though upheld by all the powers of earth. And well, indeed, did he accomplish this arduous task at the expense of his ease, and the risk of his life. "The most fearful outbreaks of regal or popular displeasure could not move his fixed purpose. He had planted himself on eternal truth, and the

wind and the rain might beat upon, but they could never stir him;" nor could they abate his courage or even intimidate his magnanimous soul.

This holy pontiff is the more worthy of our admiration in the long and heroic struggle which he sustained, as he could not hope to reap himself the fruits of so many labors. The church was destined to enjoy the effects of his untiring zeal, but not till he had crowned his noble efforts by dying in exile. Here again we are happy to avail ourselves of the formal acknowledgment and appropriate language of the reviewer.

"Had Hildebrand's sick heart failed him then, it would not have been strange; but he looked at his crucifix, at the image of his forsaken, dying, and yet victorious Master, and grew strong; for that told him how little the final triumph of a moral truth can be judged of from immediate success or failure. 'And I, too,' he murmured to himself, in words which, a few weeks later, were the last upon his lips, 'and I, too, have loved justice and hated iniquity, and I die an exile.' The future was hidden to him; but he knew that God ruled, that the great thoughts which by his struggles he had made familiar to man, rested not on his strength, but on an eternal basis; and that, though he was passing away, the Omnipotent remained as the world's ruler:—he knew that he had sown the seed, and that God would give the harvest."

ARCHÆOLOGY.—GLASS PAINTING.

BY L. C. BOISTINIERE, L.L. D.

I. *History of Glass Painting.*
II. *Legends connected with Glass Paintings.*

A former paper on sacred archæology, entitled, *Legendary basso-relievo in the middle ages*, we endeavored to illustrate an idea, which we will now attempt to elucidate still further, by examining its application to another branch of the fine arts; to an art, at one period, cultivated with love and devotion, and whose secrets are lost to this age of declining faith and meagre conceptions. We allude to the art of glass painting, to those noble compositions which, by their everlasting freshness and splendor, are still the glory and pride of many a venerable and antiquated Gothic cathedral.

The idea already mentioned, and which we wish to develop here, is: that, previous to the discovery of the art of printing, when the sacred records in the form of manuscripts could be procured and read by a very few persons only, churches adorned with all the richness of architecture, statuary, and painting, stood, as it were, like magnificent Bibles written in stone, gems, and gold, for the use of the poorer people, always open, always eloquently and energetically proclaiming the mysteries of man's destiny, from the creation to the redemption which created him anew; always presenting in the reproduction of some parable of the Gospel, or in the pious traditions of some poetic legend, lessons of morality and virtue. All the arts were then enlisted for these purposes. Thus have we seen statuary and architecture announcing to the people the first parts of that divine homily, which will end in a brilliant and impressive peroration, descending from the gorgeously stained glasses of the long choir-windows. Each stone, with its sturdy voice, each color with its symbolical meaning, blending in admirable concert with the multifarious inspirations around, composed and perfected the various parts of that soul-stirring oration which, day and night, and for years and ages, resounded in the churches of God, and moved and enraptured the hearts of the successive generations that came to listen to it. If we admit that such was the tendency of those productions, then shall we clearly understand the meaning and object of this profusion of sculpture and paintings, as well as of the minuteness and variety of details which rendered them so complete, so much like life,

and we shall perceive more than ever that that object was undoubtedly the *education of the people.*

All this is deducible, not only from the nature of those compositions, but also from the inscriptions which they bear: SANCTÆ PLEBI DEI: TO THE GOOD PEOPLE OF GOD. Such was frequently the language in which the artist dedicated his work. To the good people of God! that they may here be instructed and consoled; that they may here ponder over at leisure the teaching already inculcated from the pulpit! To the good people of God! that they may, at all hours, read and meditate the events and the lessons contained in the sacred volume, which their poverty and the circumstances of the times wherein they live withhold from their reach!

Of all the impressions which the people received in this way, the most vivid, the most striking were those produced by the inimitable glass paintings executed by the artists of the middle ages. With the most simple means they succeeded in producing the most enchanting effects, the most harmonious combinations of light and color. But, before entering any farther upon this matter, it may not be unacceptable to the curious reader to furnish him with a short sketch of the history of glass painting. We shall also place before him a brief analysis of some of the principal legends which inspired the artist in the execution of his work: and we shall conclude our remarks by adverting to the Christian hieroglyphics frequently used in this order of compositions, and by an explanation or monography of one of the most celebrated glass compositions now in existence.

I. *History of glass painting.*—This art, which is deservedly called Christian, having been invented by the first bishops, has, at several periods, attracted the attention of artists and antiquaries. We see it mentioned, towards the beginning of the eleventh century, in the old writings of Eraclius and Theophilus the monk. The first composed a treatise on Roman art: *De coloribus et artibus Romanorum;* and the second a history of the arts in general: *De omni scientiâ picturæ artis.* These compendious works contain very interesting hints about the coloring of glass, and the transparent mosaics which admitted light into the vast and sombre depths of the first Grecian and Roman churches, known under the name of basilics. Besides these writers, many able and profound antiquarians have treated this subject with erudition and interest. It will suffice to mention the names of Leviel, Brongniart, Alex. Lenoir, Langlois, E. Bareste, to whom we are much indebted. It appears from the investigations of these savans that, although transparent mosaic or stained glass was known in the first ages of Christianity, and perhaps among the Greeks and Romans, the nobler art of painting on glass with vitrifiable colors was invented by the bishops of the middle ages. In the Greek and Roman writers allusions are often made to a substance bearing a strong resemblance to our modern glass; it is uncertain, however, whether the ancients really possessed glass such as we have it, and applied it to the same uses as in our times.

The Egyptians had no windows. In a very learned dissertation on Egyptian architecture, Mr. Quatremere de Quincy says: "Windows, as we now conceive them, would not only have been completely useless, but entirely incompatible with the proportions of an Egyptian temple." Light was introduced into almost all the houses through the doors only.

Windows among the Greeks were square, with thin shelves or lattices, very much in the form of our Venitian blinds, and were called dictyston, thyris, &c.

Among the ancients the Hebrews seem to have been the most accustomed to the use of windows. They had them, not only in their houses, but also in their palaces and temples. We read in the Book of Kings that Solomon caused oblique windows to be opened in the temple of Jerusalem. These windows were long and narrow, wider in the interior than at the exterior. Some were partially closed, as those of the Greeks, with lattices, others with wooden cross pieces in the shape of a net work.

The Romans had two kinds of windows: some like incisions or clefts in the walls; others square, extending more in breadth than in height. The first were called *transennæ*, and garnished like those of the Hebrews and the Greeks, with cross works, or a sort of lattices painted red; the intervening spaces had no glass nor transparent stone, but were left open, according to the description given by St. Jerome. The other windows used by the

Romans extended, as we have said, more in breadth than in height, and were called *fenestræ*. They were furnished with wooden sashes in which were placed transparent or specular stones. These were of various kinds: the first (*lapides speculares*), which in the time of Pliny were procured from the island of Cyprus, Sicily, and Arabia, were soft and white, and formed of a great number of translucent laminæ. This stone, which has been the object of so much controversy, was nothing more than our common gypsum. The second, called *phengytes*, on account of their red veins, had the hardness of marble and the transparency of our unpolished glass. The third, *alabastrum*, were the common alabaster. The fourth (*lapides obsidianæ*), were black as jet and transparent, and were often used as mirrors. Pliny says that they rather gave the shadows of objects than the objects themselves. *Aliquando et translucidi crassiore visu, atque in speculis parietum pro imagine umbras reddente.* The fifth were simply transparent shells (*testá perlucente*). The workmen who polished or set these stones in the windows of houses or of litters were called *specularii.*

These details are sufficient to prove that the ancients did not use window glass. It was only in the fourth century, under Constantine or Theodosius, that it became a general custom to substitute colored glass in the place of specular stones. This glass was used profusely on the windows of the first churches or basilics, and, although these windows presented as yet no paintings nor any of those bold Scriptural compositions which we shall find in the cathedrals of the eleventh century, they must have made a powerful impression upon the infant imagination of barbarians and the first Christians who contemplated them. The light which penetrated through this glass into the massive piles had something grave and mystical, elevating the soul to God. In entering these temples the savage conqueror must have felt the irresistible influence of those mellowing beams of every color, vivid rainbows, pouring down upon the sacred pavement their floods of molten gold; the sapphire, emerald, ruby, and topaz must have excited a feeling of awe and veneration in the wild son of the Danube, while there arose insensibly in his bosom a desire to pray and bow down before the invisible majesty of a crucified God.

The first record of the rich effects produced by those transparent mosaics, is found in a very curious work entitled: *Constantinopolis Christiana;* it gives a relation of all the splendors which accompanied the dedication of St. Sophias under Justinian. This celebrated basilic is a grand and magnificent type of Christian art, in its first period, when Christianity, ascending in radiance from the dark catacombs never to enter them again, stepped forth with confidence upon the earth, and showed herself unfettered and triumphant under the light of heaven. This monument, commenced by the Emperor Constantine, and placed by him under the invocation of divine Wisdom, after having been successively burned and destroyed by an earthquake, was entirely reconstructed about the beginning of the fifth century by Justinian. He convened for this work the most celebrated architects of his time, and all the arts were made subservient to the glory of the house of God. All the magnificence of the Greek empire was lavished upon its decoration. Around this dome, supported by a series of columns, vast and elegant porticos extended. Every where the most precious marbles, the richest gildings, the rarest stones were distributed with profusion; bright and transparent mosaics diffused over the sanctuary a luminous and till then unrivalled splendor; waves of glorious light flowed into the nave, through innumerable windows, and such was the effulgence of those ardent beams that it seemed, says Procopus, that light itself sprang into being under the vaults of the temple. Paul the Silent commemorates in pompous verses the magical effect produced by the morning rays of the sun, falling, like golden arrows, upon the windows of the holy edifice. St. Sophia, clad in this robe of splendors, and adorned with sumptuous magnificence, surpassed all that had been known before, and one may judge of the admiration that such an array of wonder inspired, by the words which fell from the lips of Justinian, during the ceremony of the dedication: "*Glory be to God, who hath permitted that I should finish so great a work . . . . . O! Solomon, I have surpassed thee! . . .*"

This new style of decoration was subsequently introduced among all the Christian nations. Bishops themselves became glass painters; poets made this new style of orna-

ment the theme of their song, and historians have transmitted the names of the architects who caused colored glass to be placed in the windows of public and religious edifices. At the end of the seventh century, St. Wilfred sent to France to procure painters and colored glass for the completion of the noble cathedral of York. A short time after St. Bennet Biscop, abbot of Weremouth, introduced distinguished glass painters into England to work at the windows of monasteries and churches, and to teach their art to others. The Anglo-Saxons, enraptured with the elegant discovery, set themselves to work, and became in a very short time expert in the coloring of glass. Bishops Wilbred, Winfrid, and Wildehard, Englishmen by birth, did not not think it derogatory to the dignity of their station to teach this new art to their countrymen. Their example was followed in the middle of the ninth century by the first apostles of Sweden and Denmark, St. Anchaire and St. Rembert.

So far we have alluded only to translucent mosaics, formed of compartments of colored glass, fastened in the church windows with a kind of cement; we have now to speak of the art in its improved and elevated state, ceasing to be ornamental and secondary only, and becoming creative. After many long and unsuccessful attempts, the artist succeeded, by means of a vitrifiable color, in painting on the large window glasses, the boldest and most impressive compositions, with the same ease and finish that were practicable in oil painting, but with a much greater vividness and expression. According to a passage in the works of Leo of Ostia, abbot of Mount Cassino, this advancement seems to have taken place in the middle of the eleventh century. In the year 1058 the abbot Desiderius, one of the predecessors of Leo of Ostia, enriched with glass paintings the capitular hall of this abbey. In 1066 the celebrated church of St. Benedict, reconstructed by Desiderius, possessed twenty-nine windows nine cubits in height, and adorned with glass works enchased in lead, and supported by transversal iron rods.

A contemporary of Abbot Desiderius, Theophilus the monk, who qualifies himself in his preface as *humilis presbyter, servus servorum Domini,* has left us a very exact account of the fine arts in the eleventh century, among different nations. "O you," says he, "who will read this book, I will conceal from you nothing of what I have been able to learn. I will tell you what the Greeks know about selecting and mixing colors; the Italians in the fabrication of vases, in gilding and in sculpturing ivory and precious stones; the Tuscans in the art of working amber; the Arabians in chiselling and incrustating. I will show you how France manufactures the precious glass paintings which adorn her windows; how the industrious German works in gold, silver, brass, iron, and in the carving of wood." According to this author, France, during the eleventh century, was celebrated for her glass paintings; but a century after, in the time of Suger, it appears that the glass painters exercised their skill elsewhere, as Suger himself was obliged to procure artists and glaziers from foreign nations. Dom Doublet relates this fact in his History of the Abbey of St. Denis.

We have now come to the twelfth century; during this and the two succeeding ages, glass painting attained its full development, received its highest inspirations, and became a species of religious book, prepared by the bishops for the instruction of the people. This we have already gathered from the significant inscription, SANCTÆ PLEBI DEI, *to the good people of God,* which is still legible on a great number of these old compositions. Similar dedications are to be observed in many places, varying in words, but the same in spirit. Thus do we read, under the three glass compositions in the church of St. Niziers at Troyes, the following inscription:

MASTER ODART MOLE, CURATE OF THIS CHURCH, AND CANON OF ST. PETER, HAS CAUSED THESE THREE PAINTINGS, TOGETHER WITH THE WRITING THEY CONTAIN, TO BE MADE AS A CATECHISM AND BOOK OF INSTRUCTION FOR THE PEOPLE.

We will here close this rapid glance at the history of an art which, after having produced, during four centuries, the most astonishing master-pieces, and illustrated, in a most striking and impressive manner, the whole series of events commemorated by the Christian world, declined by degrees until it lost itself completely in the turmoil and excitement of ages bent on more material pursuits. It was a messenger from heaven, for a short time only, expanding its wings over the earth,

and then flying back again to the source of all inspiration, after having accomplished its mission of love and of faith.

II. *Legends connected with glass painting.*—We now enter upon a subject which the reader will probably find more interesting. Before we present any monography or description of various glass paintings, we will place before the reader, in a rapid sketch, some of the principal legends which, together with scenes and parables from the Gospel, were commonly the subject of those sacred delineations. We shall draw most of our facts and ideas from the learned disquisitions of Mr. Cyprian Robert, E. Bareste, Douhaire, and the old collections of Henry Sickius, Mathurin, Veyssiere, and Wallinus. We will quote them freely.

The elements which served for the composition of those legends were, in general, very uniform, resembling in this respect those heroic traditions of Greece, at the period of the settlement of the Hellenes in Europe, and which, during the five following centuries, furnished such rich materials for odes, dramas, songs, and poems of every description; those of Homer himself are thought to be but a collection of legends. Like these primitive Grecian poems, those of the middle ages, the religious especially, are founded upon a simple tale going back to the first ages of the church, and, as is the case with all primitive poetry, embellished and enlarged in passing through successive generations. Among those legends some have a strong character of unity, principally those referring to personages of the Gospel, and they always obey the law of a simultaneous development. Were they considered as isolated productions of the age in which they appeared, without any influence upon subsequent times, these legends of the nascent church would still form one of the most curious and interesting departments of literature. But they acquire a greater importance from the fact that they contributed vastly and beneficially to the development of poetry in succeeding ages. After having been the inspiration of epic poetry, of tragedy, of painting, of sculpture, during the mediœval period, in more modern times, like the flame of an expiring lamp, they cast their brightest splendors upon the *Paradise Lost* of Milton, and the *Messiah* of Klopstock, and then suddenly disappeared.

One of the most ancient among these legends, and that which we find frequently reproduced in glass paintings, is known under the name of the *Gospel of our Saviour's infancy*, the Arabic original of which was for the first time published in the sixteenth century by Henry Sickius. It was attributed to St. Matthew, St. James, and St. Peter, but more generally to St. Thomas. St. Irenæus considers it a production of the Marcionites; Origen attributes it to Basilides. Eusebius says that it is a heretical production. Travellers have met with it in Persia, Syria, among the Copts of Egypt, the Arabians of the Desert, and among the Christians of St. Thomas in the Eest Indies. The Mahometans themselves, in incorporating it in the book of the prophet, have altered it but slightly. It is a collection of traditions, more or less probable, regarding the flight of the holy family into Egypt, their residence in that country, their return to Jerusalem, and the education of the infant Jesus. This legend, which we extract from Henry Sickius, begins thus:

"In the name of the one God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

"We commence under his auspices the history of the miracles of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The peace of the Lord be with us! Amen.

"We find in the book of the Pontiff Joseph, who lived in the time of Christ, that Jesus, being in his cradle, said one day to Mary his mother: I am the Son of God, Jesus, the Word announced to thee by Gabriel. My Father hath sent me to save the world."

The legend continues, and relates the journey of Joseph in obedience to the edict, the delivery of Mary in the grotto of Bethleem, the arrival of the shepherds, that of the wise men, the anger of Herod, and the flight into Egypt. This journey to Egypt is full of marvels. When the divine Infant approached a town the idols fell before their altars, and the sick were cured. . . . After a long journey they (the holy family) fell among robbers who took every thing from them, even their provisions, and treated in the same manner the other travellers of the caravan who journeyed with them. But whilst the robbers were busy in gathering their spoils, suddenly a great clamor was heard like that of a royal army advancing from the neighboring town, with

loud cymbals and prancing coursers. The frightened robbers fled in haste, leaving their booty on the ground. Then the travellers of the caravan, who had been bound with chains, unloosed their fetters, and coming to Joseph and Mary, asked them: Where is now the king whom we heard coming, and whose approach delivered us from the enemy? He walks behind us, said Joseph.

Coming to another town, they were met by a woman possessed with a devil, who recognised and cursed the Son of God, and was restored by him to health. The next day they resumed their journey, and reached a city where they were hospitably received. The family, however, with whom they staid were very sad, the young bride having suddenly been struck dumb. But having received the infant Jesus in her arms and kissed him, she recovered the power of speech. The rest of the journey is an uninterrupted succession of wonders. One day they met a band of robbers, the chief of whom were Titus and Damascus, renowned throughout that country. Titus insisted upon permitting the holy family to proceed unmolested; but his colleague was devoid of mercy. In order to prevail with the rapacious man, Titus untied his belt and presented him thirty drachmæ. On beholding this act of generosity, Mary was deeply moved, and exclaimed: The Lord will forgive thy faults, and receive thee at his right hand. Then Jesus added: Thirty years hence they will both be near me, the one on my right, the other on my left hand; but Titus alone will go with me to heaven. Another day they stopped in the wilderness, and found no water. Jesus striking the earth, a fountain broke forth, and has flowed ever since. A village was built around it, which at the present day is the city of Cairo.

After an exile of three years, the holy family returned to Judea, where the presence of the infant Jesus wrought many miracles in behalf of the sick and the poor. Throughout the whole of this legend our Blessed Lady acts the part of a most kind and excellent woman.

At the age of seven Jesus assumes a bolder and more decided mien. "One day he was playing with other children of his age, and like them, making little birds with soft clay. They all rivalled each other in working, and in praising their work. 'I,' said Jesus, 'will order the birds I have made to walk.' 'Art thou then the Son of God?' asked his companions. . . . . But Jesus, without answering, bade the birds move, and they flew off. He then commanded them to return, and they obeyed him. In this way he made several sparrows that were perfectly docile, walking, flying about, and eating from his hand."

This little story is extremely entertaining, and although well known, and frequently represented in painting, we could not refrain from presenting it to our readers. There are several others equally affecting, as that of the resurrection of a child bitten by a serpent, and the triumph of Jesus, carried through the streets by children amidst the joyous chants of the youthful retinue.

It is easy to perceive what fine subjects are here presented for the painter's brush. The artists of the middle ages, charmed with the touching incidents of this legend, reproduced it on several occasions, in great detail, and with the most unaffected simplicity. This legend closes at the time when Jesus was found by Mary discoursing with the priests and doctors in the temple of Jerusalem. "From that moment," says the legend, "his life changed; he began to veil the miracles he wrought, and to lead a more mysterious existence. He lived thus to the age of thirty, when he began his mission, and the Holy Ghost descending over him in the shape of a dove, a voice was heard from heaven, saying: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

Thus ends the poetic history of the first periods of our Saviour's life. This life is continued in another legend, known as the *Gospel of Nicodemus.* This has all the characters of an epic poem, and has also given birth to many a bright and richly colored glass painting. We think that, after having perused the extract here given, the reader will agree with us that as an epic poem this legend has, in some of its parts, seldom been equalled. Milton and Klopstock drew largely upon it, and, in many cases, they had nothing more to do than to add the charm of their melodious versification to the varied beauties with which this legend abounds.

The poem, for we may well call it so, opens in a very dramatic manner. It describes the triumphant entry of Jesus into Jerusalem. The shouts of the multitude that follow the

Messiah, have excited the jealous anger of the principal men among the Jews, the chiefs of the synagogue. They run to Pilate and summon him to quell the enthusiastic transports of the crowd, misled by the notorious Son of Joseph the carpenter, who calls himself King and Son of God, and who violates the ancient law of the Sabbath. Pilate, yielding to their importunities, orders an usher of his palace to bring Jesus before him, without, however, having recourse to violence or ill treatment. But soon after, a man enters, announcing to the governor that the usher whom he had sent to arrest the disturber of the peace, has joined the people in their transports, has become an adorer of Jesus, and has spread under his feet the flag which he bore folded around his lance. The Jews who stood near Pilate were indignant at this audacity of a public officer, and demanded his punishment. The usher at this moment enters himself. Pilate upbraids him for his conduct: "Why have you acted thus?" . . . . "Lord governor," answers the usher, "when you sent me to Jerusalem to arrest Jesus, I found him mounted on an ass, surrounded by a crowd who held palms in their hands, and cried: 'Glory be to the Son of David!' Some spread their garments on the earth, when Jesus passed, saying to him: 'Save us, O thou who comest from heaven. Blessed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord!' . . . and I adored him like the others."

Jesus, however, is brought into the presence of Pilate, and the soldiers who stood guard lower their eagles before him. The Jews are scandalized by this conduct, and loudly remonstrate against the offenders; but the soldiers assure them that they did not participate in the deed; that the ensigns, in spite of their efforts, waved and bowed when Jesus passed them. The Jews refuse to believe them, and a new trial commences. Jesus is brought back before the guard, and the ensigns fall again. The Jews become furious with rage. Pilate, pale and trembling, wishes to quit his seat, but detained there by a sense of duty, and the increasing clamors of the crowd, the wretched man remains. Whilst the adversaries of the Messiah are vociferating against him, all the lame whom he had made whole, all the blind whose sight he had restored, all the sick whom he had healed; in a word, all those who had been benefited by his kindness, come and testify in his favor. First appears the palsied man healed at the pool of Siloe: then the man born blind, then the lame man, then the leper. Surrounding them are a crowd of compassionate Jews, who weep, anticipating the fate of Jesus: "*Intrans præses in populum circumstantem Judæorum vidit plurimos lacrymantes.*" There is assuredly some grandeur in these last incidents of the legend, which gives no new details relative to the scene of Calvary, but follows the Gospel narrative. It is from the resurrection only that the legend derives that epic character, that sublimity of tone, of which we have spoken.

Jesus is dead; . . . . . darkness overshadows the earth; Jerusalem is all in confusion; the people murmur; but, unmoved by these events, the chiefs of the priests pursue their designs. They seal the entrance of the sepulchre where Jesus reposes; they station near it a guard of soldiers, and cast into prison Joseph of Arimathia, because in the name of the disciples he had come to ask for the body of their Master. But all these precautions are useless. The guards of the sepulchre arrive, and proclaim that Christ has risen from the dead, that they saw him spring forth from the grave, and speak to the women who sat and wept hard by. Though the people refuse to believe it, they persist in declaring what they have heard and seen. In vain is an attempt made to bribe them; the news continues to spread in every direction, and is confirmed every moment by the arrival of further intelligence. The venerable Joseph of Arimathia adds to the confusion of the magistrates, by announcing to them that not only had Christ risen from the grave, but that also several illustrious individuals had returned to life with him.

"Listen to me," says he: "We all knew Simeon, the high priest, who received the infant Jesus in his arms, when he was presented in the temple. Simeon had two sons, and we all assisted at their death and sepulture. Now come with me, see their tombs: they are open! Carinus and Leucius, repose no longer there. They are at this hour in the town of Arimathia, where they pray in silence without speaking to any one."

This intelligence casts dismay among the chief priests and the Pharisees, and no one doubts it after the testimony of Joseph of Ari-

mathia. They now deliberate upon what is to be done. On motion of Joseph of Arimathia, the resuscitated sons of Simeon are called into the synagogue, and requested by the magistrates to relate the events which had taken place in the region of the dead; and how they had been restored to life. Upon this, Carinus and Leucius betray considerable emotion, and lifting their eyes to heaven, then making the sign of the cross upon their tongues, they request that a book be given to each one of them, in order to write what had taken place. The books having been furnished, they sat down and wrote in silence what follows:

"We were seated with our fathers in darkness in the depths of the grave, when suddenly a light, warm and brilliant, darted like a beam from heaven, and illumined our midst. Then the father of the human race, Adam, and all the patriarchs and prophets exclaimed: This light comes from the Author of all light, and announces the dawn of eternal day!

"Isaiah then arose and said: behold the light of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, of whom I foretold when on earth: *Land of Zebulon, land of Nepthali, men of Galilee, the people who are in darkness will see a great light, and it will shine upon those who sit in the shadow of death!*

"And we all rejoiced at the splendor of the light that shone upon us. Simeon our father cried out in a loud voice: 'Glory be to Jesus Christ, Son of God, of whom I said formerly when he lay in my arms in the temple: *mine eyes, O Lord, have seen thy salvation, the salvation thou hast prepared for the world, a light to the revelation of the gentiles and the glory of the people of Israel!*'

"And all heard this with increased transports of joy.

"Then in the midst of us came one like a hermit of the wilderness, and we interrogated him: who art thou? He answered, I am John, the voice of the Almighty, the prophet, the precursor, who walked before him to prepare his ways, and give to the people the science of salvation. Seeing the Saviour coming to me, I cried out to the people: *Behold the Lamb of God who washes away the sins of the world!* I baptized him in the waters of the Jordan, and I saw the Holy Ghost descend upon him in the shape of a dove, and I heard a voice saying: *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, hear ye him!* And now, I walk again before him, and announce to you that his coming is nigh.

"Hearing that Jesus had been baptized in the Jordan, the first created among men, Adam, said to Seth, his son: My son, relate to the patriarchs and prophets what the archangel Michael said to you, when old and infirm I sent you to the entrance of the earthly Paradise, to ask for some balm of the tree of mercy, to anoint my decaying limbs.* Seth then, drawing near to the patriarchs and prophets, related to them what follows:

"My father having become old, and being near his death, sent me to the gate of Paradise, to beg of God that he would permit me to enter and gather some oil from the tree of mercy. I obeyed my father; and as I prayed at the entrance, an angel of the Lord appeared to me and said: What do you want? The balm of the tree of mercy, to restore your father to health? You can find none here now. Go back, and tell your father that when four thousand years will have elapsed, the beloved Son of God will descend upon the earth, and resuscitate the body of Adam, with those of all good men who will have died during that period, and, ascending from the waters of the Jordan, he will anoint with the balm of mercy all those who believe in him, and that balm will endure to the end of time. Then Jesus Christ will introduce thy father into Paradise.

"The patriarchs and prophets were filled with joy on hearing these words of Seth."

With this beautiful and majestic reunion of the saints of the old law, the narrative of the sons of Simeon contrasts a dark conventicle of demons deliberating upon the treatment they will offer to the soul of Jesus, when he descends into hell. "I have triumphed over him," exclaims Satan, "I have excited the Jews against him, and at this very hour he is expiring on a cross." This chief of the rebel angels, who presides in the councils of the infernal hosts, speaks of Jesus in a tone of derision: "That Jesus," says he, "who preclaims himself the

* Here appears the first vestige of the legend of Seth, so often represented in the middle ages—and which occupies so prominent a place in the celebrated legend of the *Wandering Jew*. This is not, after all, the only fable that oriental fancy has connected with the name of Seth. According to a variety of testimony collected by Fabricius, (Codex v, fol. 1, p. 141,) there exists a complete imaginative history of this first of the patriarchs, in which he is represented as being the inventor of letters, the sciences, and the fine arts, etc.—See Seldenis, *Dissert. de Horto Hedensi.*

Son of God, and who is but a man, is afraid of death, crying out: *My soul is sad even unto death.* And yet," adds Satan, "he has greatly opposed me, for he has cured a vast number of wretches whom I had deprived of the use of their limbs: and several souls I was carrying to thee, O Lucifer, he has rescued from my grasp! . . . . . ."

Lucifer is the king of the infernal empire, and Satan is his first minister. Lucifer, who proudly holds the sceptre, can not share in the disdain which his lieutenant manifests for a man who has opposed their designs with so much success. "Who is he, then," asks he, "that man who fears death, and yet surpasses in power all the powerful on earth, who have been brought hither without resistance? . . . . . If thou, Satan, speak the truth, he may be a God, who pretends to fear death in order to deceive thee. Wo to thee, wo for ever, if thou art vanquished."

Satan affects not to fear Jesus, boasting that he has him in his power, and that his friends, the priests, the scribes, and the Pharisees, will send his soul to him forthwith.

"Whilst Lucifer and his first minister were thus conversing, a voice like that of thunder was heard:* *Princes, open your gates, be raised up eternal gates, the king of glory is advancing. Tollite portas, principes, vestras; et elevamini portæ eternales, et introibit rex gloriæ.* Hearing these words, Lucifer cries out to Satan his minister: fly away, leave me; or if thou art a valiant warrior, go and give battle to that king of glory. He then drove him away, and calling his impious army, he said to them: close the brazen gates, fasten the iron bolts, and resist with courage, if you wish to escape captivity.

"The saints, hearing these orders given by Lucifer, felt indignant, and unanimously exclaimed: Open your gates and let the King of glory enter; and David, raising his voice, added: Have I not said, *Let us sing the Lord's mercy, let us celebrate his marvels towards the sons of men, for he has burst the brazen gates, and the iron bolts has he broken?* Have I not also said: *The dead will be resuscitated, they who are in the graves will rise again, they on earth will rejoice, for the dews of heaven have come to them?* and all the saints repeated: Lucifer, open thy gates: from this day thy power has ceased, and the voice from without resounded again as a clap of thunder: *attollite portas principes, vestras; et elevamini portæ eternales, et introibit rex gloriæ!* Lucifer, as if he did not comprehend, asked: Who is that King of glory? . . . I know these words, answered David, I formerly pronounced them, I will repeat to thee, O Lucifer, what I then said: *He is the mighty and powerful God, powerful in wars: he is the King of glory. He has listened from heaven to the groans of the captives, and he has delivered the sons of the dead.* No sooner had David pronounced these words than the King of glory appeared in human form. His presence illumed the eternal darkness, and loosed our fetters."

It would be difficult to imagine, says McDonhaire, a more striking and more dramatic scene. Could fancy create a bolder contrast than that presented between the venerable assembly of the saints gathered around the father of mankind at the dawning of their deliverance, and the infernal congress of demons united to devise a plan of vengeance against Jesus? But the most ingenious idea is that solemn confronting of the two periods, the old and the new, that verification of the prophecies by the prophets themselves, and that awakening of a generation of four thousand years, at the sound of a voice which they had only heard before in a mysterious manner.

The shock and agitation caused by the arrival of Christ in the kingdom of the dead soon reach its farthest boundaries. The dead awake and rise to a man, still under the impression of a pleasing dream, and they contemplate in holy ecstacy the completion of the promises in the belief of which they had descended into the sleep of the grave.

Christ extends his hand towards the just. At his feet Adam, the father of all men, sings in rapture that beautiful psalm of David in which David himself exclaims: *Cantate Domino canticum novum, quia mirabilia fecit, etc.* Sing a new canticle to the Lord, for he has done marvels, &c., and the crowd of the just repeat *Alleluia, amen!* On the other side are heard the maledictions and gnashing of teeth of the demons.

"Then, says the legend, two men of old joined the company of the just as they ascend up

* Lift up your gates, O ye princes, and be ye lifted up, O eternal gates, and the king of glory shall enter in.

to heaven. Who are you, they ask, who go up to heaven with us although you were not with us in limbo? One of them answered: I am Enoch, transported from earth to heaven by the word of the Lord. This is Elias, the Thebite, carried away on a fiery chariot. We did not taste death as the rest of men; the Lord has kept us in reserve for the days of Antichrist. After having combated against him with prodigies and miracles, we shall be put to death in Jerusalem, and the fourth day after we shall be carried again into the skies.

"Enoch and Elias were still speaking when there advanced towards them a man of wretched mien, and carrying a cross upon his shoulders. All the just observed him. Who art thou? asked they, for thy appearance is that of a thief. Why this cross on thy shoulders? He answered: You speak the truth; I have been doing evil on earth. The Jews crucified me with Jesus; but seeing the convulsion of all nature at his death, I acknowledged him as the sovereign Lord of heaven and earth, and I prayed to him, saying: Remember me, O Lord, when you will be in your kingdom! He heard my prayer, and inclining his head, he said to me: Amen, amen, I say to thee, this day thou wilt be with me in paradise. Carry this cross with thee, go to Michael the archangel, who watches at the gate of heaven, and say to him: Jesus the son of God, at this time crucified, hath sent me hither. I did thus, and the angel opened unto me and gave me a place in paradise, saying: Wait here a little; Adam, the first man, will soon arrive with all the just. When I saw you all reunited together, I came to join you.

"Thus spoke the good thief, and all the saints, after having heard him, exclaimed: Thou art great, O Lord! and great is thy power! . . ."

Here end the revelations of Carinus and Leucius. The two sons of Simeon were forbidden to reveal any thing further touching the mysteries of heaven. They were commanded, after having shown themselves in Jerusalem, to retire to the other bank of the Jordan, into a rich and pleasant valley, and there to celebrate the passover with other holy personages restored to life, in order to accomplish this great mystery. Three days only had been allotted for the term of their residence on earth.

"When they had finished their writing," continues the legend, "they arose and gave one of their books to the magistrates, and the other to Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus. They were then transformed, becoming white as snow, and disappearing. Their books, when compared, were found exactly alike, the one not having a single letter more than the other."

The Greek text of this legend ends here, but a Latin version of it adds that the Jews of the synagogue, witnesses of this prodigy, recognised the hand of the Lord, and withdrew, full of confusion and smiting their breasts. According to the same version, Pilate ordered the priests of the temple to preserve these precious manuscripts in their library, and himself began an information upon the divinity of Jesus, who was formally recognised, at last, as the true Messiah. Upon which the governor wrote to Rome to acquaint the emperor Claudius with all that had happened. Some details have also reached us touching the more or less apocryphal conversion of Pilate, but we will abstain from mentioning them, and thus put an end to a paper already too lengthy.

In our next we intend continuing the same matter in presenting a rapid view of some of the Christian hieroglyphics found and mixed with many of the artistic productions of the middle ages, and terminate by a monography of a celebrated glass painting,—most of those glass paintings being but an illustration of the Gospel and of the two legends we have presented to the reader,—as the best commentary to the paintings we could offer him.

THE STUDENT OF BLENHEIM FOREST,

OR THE TRIALS OF A CONVERT.

BY MRS. ANNA H. DORSEY.

Continued from p. 388.

CHAPTER XVI.

Sketches of Character—Oddity and Piety.

OOD morning, Madam Botelar, good morning; I hope I find you perfectly well to-day," exclaimed a tall and rather strangely dressed lady, entering the parlor hastily, and without ceremony.

"Good morning, Mrs. Talmadge; pray, be seated," said Mrs. Botelar, rising and courteously offering her hand; "I am really glad to see you."

"I hope you are," answered her visiter, taking a chair, "though the fact of the matter is just this: there is so much insincerity among what the world calls polite society, that it is really a sort of penance for me to mingle with it. They are all so high up in the clouds that they scarcely ever have any thing better than a dish of vapors for their friends; this sort of flummery don't suit me, so I take my own course, which you know is rather a helter-skelter one, and try to keep my heart in the right place!"

"Mrs. Talmadge," responded Mrs. Botelar, "is quite a philosopher; it is true, however, as she says, her heart is in the right place, but there are some qualities which it is quite as necessary to keep in check."

"I cry your mercy," exclaimed Mrs. Talmadge, interrupting her, and wincing a little under her quiet reproof; "you know I must have my say out, good, bad, or indifferent though it may be!"

"So you will, my dear," answered Mrs. Botelar kindly, "and more's the pity! I am often astonished that a lady of your fine sense, good heart, and really good qualities, should be so extremely incautious, and allow me to say imprudent in her language, as you frequently are, and at the same time exercise so little judgment with regard to your expressions."

"Dear heart alive!" cried the incorrigible lady, laughing heartily; "certainly out of all these little goods I shall be able, after a while, to patch up quite a large one, at least large enough to cover some of my misdemeanors; meanwhile I will let good judgment, with its solemn owl's face, off."

Clavering entered the room just then, but seeing a stranger in such confidential conversation with Mrs. Botelar, was about retiring again, when she called to him, and, with a lurking mischief in her eye, introduced him to Mrs. Talmadge. She sprang up, and seizing his hand, exclaimed: "You are the very person I wanted, above all others, to see —a convert—a Virginian! and had trouble about your religion in the bargain! Shake hands—shake hands—don't mind my way; I'm rough—but nothing for that—another shake; a convert! well, blessed be God for all things!"

Clavering was at a perfect loss; he had never met with one of this *genus* before, and was undetermined how to address her as she sat down again quite exhausted! Mrs. Botelar, in her quiet way, enjoyed the scene, but asked Clavering some indifferent questions for the purpose of giving him time to recover his self-possession, at last he observed: "Virginians, madam, should never meet each other as strangers."

"No, never," she answered, "never; give me a shake of the hand, a *grip*, if you will, before all the bowing and courtesies this side of France, and a kind hearty word, I don't care if it is rough, before all the mincing remarks about the weather this—or the sunshine that—

or the rain the other, that ever the earth knew."

"Exactly," answered Clavering, beginning to understand the kind of character he had to deal with; "sincerity is a virtue which ranks high above the maxims of the world."

"True, my dear sir," observed Mrs. Botelar, "true; but remember the old proverb of 'whoever renders truth disagreeable commits high treason against virtue.'"

"Now, Madam Botelar, I know that is a thrust at me; but I give you fair warning, if you preach so many sermons at me, I shall become so disagreeable that you will be the cause of the very treason of which you speak. But, tell me, how do you like this shawl of mine; well, I bought it from a poor German immigrant, who has known better days, and who is literally starving for the want of those little necessary comforts to which she has been accustomed. It was her last piece of finery, and although it is gaudy, and in rather bad taste, as far as color and design go, as I stood in need of a shawl, I bought this at her earnest request, and intend wearing it too. I'm very independent in matters of this kind, Mr. Clavering; but, hey day," continued Mrs. Talmadge, looking at her watch, "two o'clock! bless me, I must be off. I must be at the asylum by three, to consult with the lady managers about getting two destitute orphans in the institution."

"Good soul," said Mrs. Botelar, taking her hand, and pressing it kindly, "you make me love you with all your oddities, because the goodness of your excellent and sincere heart imparts the hue of its own virtue to every act."

Mrs. Talmadge was touched by this unexpected proof of Mrs. Botelar's friendship for her, and looked at her a moment in silence, while a tear moistened her eyes; but hers was not the nature to give way to emotion of this kind, and she turned with a smile to Clavering, and observed dryly: "This is the way that the queen of Sheba and I always end our quarrels."

Mrs. Botelar was called out an instant to see a mendicant at the door, and as she walked out, her long dress majestically sweeping the floor, and her fine person erect, Mrs. Talmadge lifted her hands, and whispered, "Now, in your life, sir, did you ever see so stately a body; she looks like a fine old picture, walking about in one's dreams. Mr. Clavering, come and see me to-morrow, I want to talk about the dear old state, and may-be, cry a little too; but no, I hate crying people! Come, though, at any rate; for, if you do not, I shall bring my work round, and inflict my company the whole day on Mrs. Botelar and yourself. Do promise me, because I assure you it will be a charity extended to certain individuals who expect to see me at home to-morrow!"

So closely and kindly pressed, he could not refuse; so giving her an affirmative answer, she skook hands and darted off, almost upsetting Mrs. Botelar as they met unexpectedly at the parlor door. Stopping an instant to apologize, and utter a hasty adieu, she proceeded rapidly on for the purpose of accomplishing the charitable object of which she had spoken. "Bless me, bless me," said Mrs. Botelar, with a little frown just perceptible on her brow, "what rough people one meets with sometimes in the world; I am quite in a tremor! Mrs. Talmadge is a good, excellent creature, but too rough indeed!"

"Can I assist you, madam?"

"Oh no, thank you, my dear; the puckers are all straight now, I believe. Let us sit down and enjoy a little quiet chat, which I always need after spending an hour with Mrs. Talmadge. When I was young I could have enjoyed her queer points, but they fatigue me now! By the by, are you going to see her?"

"Yes, madam, to-morrow morning I promised to pay my respects."

"I am glad to hear it. Yes, go, by all means; you'll be amused, and if you should perchance meet with any of her pensioners, you'll be edified. She is certainly the most charitable woman I ever knew, and beneath all this assumed carelessness of manner, runs an under current of unwavering and steady piety; but I really wish Mrs. Talmadge would be true to herself; she is an intelligent woman, and could be, if she chose, more refined and gentle in her manner; but she has set up this harum-scarum kind of a character, and so feels privileged to act as she pleases."

"It is a pity, but could she not be persuaded to lay aside some of those eccentric qualities?"

"Oh no, I believe not. I have done all that a friend could prudently do to effect this ob-

ject, but without success; for she is perfectly enchanted with her way, and to all my arguments replies, 'It will be all the same a hundred years hence.' Lead the conversation to-morrow to her first Catholic impressions, and if you are not amused, you may call your old friend a false prophet."

That evening Clavering spent, as usual, with Father Francis. He was preparing, with the purest and most suitable sentiments, to make his first communion. *Books* had been laid aside, and with his Rosary, and the "Following of Christ" by Thomas à Kempis, the hours glided by in sweet and tranquil numbers. All was calm; the raging storm was hushed, and in blessed hope he awaited the coming of his heavenly guest. But a few days longer, and the Lord would come under the spotless sacramental veil, to abide for a season with him. Illimitable praise and thanksgiving be to our Lord God, for this beaming way-mark along the shores of life, for this refreshment in the wilderness, for this consolation amidst the shadows of death, and safeguard beyond. Let us not despair when the thorn pierces our hearts, for here is a balm; let us not faint when heat and labor overcome our trembling frames, for with a supernatural strength it will bear us up; and when tears flow in torrents from broken hearts that leaned too securely on earth's promises, here is the kind physician, who, with cords of eternal love, will bind the fragments together, whose links will ascend upward, in sweet succession, from earth to heaven. . . . .

The next day Clavering procured from his kind friend the address of Mrs. Talmadge, and after a circuitous and fatiguing walk, found himself at her door. Her house gave evidence of wealth and style, at least every thing about it had once been new and handsome, but the good lady had so little time to spare from her extensive charities, or devote to any thing beyond the mere domestic details which are absolutely necessary in a family, that every thing wore a dingy and disordered appearance. He was ushered in by a little girl, and found Mrs. Talmadge comfortably seated by a blazing fire, and knitting away on a pair of large coarse yarn stockings, as if her life depended on her success. "Mr. Clavering! how are you? I am truly rejoiced to see you," she said, extending her hand with a smile of welcome. This he warmly grasped, and reciprocated all her kind inquiries with a sincerity of manner perfectly congenial with her own, and which appeared to afford her the most unmitigated pleasure. "I am so delighted to find that Madam Botelar, with her grand, stately airs, has not petrified you," she exclaimed.

"Should such a deplorable event ever occur, I would most assuredly come to Mrs. Talmadge for an antidote," he replied, bowing.

"Ah, well! it will be all the same a hundred years hence; but come, draw your chair closer to my work table, it will look more cosy, and talk to me, for I declare I am almost too busy to look at you; but pshaw! never mind, I don't see Virginians every day, so lie there, stockings. I am knitting them for one of my Greeks."

"Greeks, madam," asked Clavering in surprise.

"Did you never hear, Mr. Clavering, what old John of Roanoke once said to a lady who solicited his charity for a fair which was in progress?"

"I do not remember."

"Well, you *do* remember, though, what a fierce old chap this same John Randolph was, and what biting sarcasms he could sometimes inflict on his best friends?"

"Exactly."

"He went to visit this lady, and at the termination of his visit, as she stood on the portico chatting with him, he cast those keen little eyes of his around the place, and saw several negroes who appeared half starved and literally in tatters. 'Oh! Mr. Randolph,' she lisped, rustling her silks, 'I have been commissioned to beg a donation of you for a fair which we are getting up for the benefit of the indigent Greeks.' 'The Greeks are at your door, madam,' he replied in a stern voice, and with his finger pointing to her ill treated slaves, while his keen, penetrating eyes probed her very heart with their searching glance. In another instant he was in his saddle, and galloping off as if contagion were at his heels, for you know that a kinder and more benevolent and indulgent master never owned a slave, and how bitterly he detested any thing like tyranny or neglect to those unfortunate creatures, whose bondage, as a hereditary and necessary evil, has been transmitted with all its train of at-

tendant reproaches to us by our forefathers. But, Mr. Clavering, do allow me to ask how it happens that you are a Catholic? I am all curiosity to hear."

"Will you allow me the privilege, madam, of making the same inquiry of you?" said Clavering, remembering Mrs. Botelar's injunction; "we can then compare notes. I have understood that your first Catholic impressions are a little remarkable."

"Remarkable for their queerness," said Mrs. Talmadge, "or rather their singularity. But I will tell you. I really can not help laughing sometimes when I think of the awful consternation my poor, dear husband, Jack Talmadge, would be in if he could raise his head from the grave, and see me a Roman Catholic! He was a deacon in the Presbyterian church down in Stonnington, away off in the sou'west corner of the old state, and a most excellent man he was too; truly a good man. One morning before breakfast he was conning over the 'Orthodox Organ,' which he had just received among some other papers from Baltimore by the mail, when a paragraph printed in capitals under the head of 'AWFUL AND TERRIFIC NEWS,' arrested his attention. He uttered such a cry of astonishment and terror after he had read it, that I thought, for an instant, he had been seized with a mortal illness. 'I predicted it,' he cried—'they are coming at last.' 'Who, my dear?' I inquired. 'Who, do you ask? invaders, marauders, idolaters, the papists are coming.' 'Pish,' said I, 'I thought it was the British!' 'You won't be so well satisfied, Mrs. Talmadge,' he said, becoming desperately calm, and pressing the fore-finger of his right hand very impressively into the open palm of his left, while his eyes, dilating with dismay, almost started from their sockets; 'you will not be so well satisfied, I say, when you hear that the pope—mark; the pope of Rome—is sending over armies disguised as emigrants to lay waste the liberties of our free and happy land; but this is not all, Mrs. Talmadge, no, far from being all; when this is accomplished, another pope—another pope, remember—is to be sent to America to rule the destiny of free-born millions.' 'Oh, dear me,' exclaimed I, becoming alarmed too, 'what is to be done?' 'Done—done,' he cried, again starting off, and waving his arms about him in an ecstacy of fear, 'run and collect together the Presbytery as soon as possible. I will go to our brethren in the lower streets of the town, and give the alarm, while you go abroad and sound the news in every direction; yes, we will collect them together, and devise ways and means to drive these invaders from our shores, with all their wickedness and car of Juggernaut.' In his haste he stumbled over our large house dog, who lay in his way, and falling against the breakfast table, upset it and its contents, and striking his head as he fell against a china bowl, received a severe wound just across his temple. Poor man! this accident, with the excitement he was under, brought on a fever, which was not abated by the company of elders and deacons who came every evening to console him, and read to him as they sat huddled up around the table, 'awful disclosures' which had been made by anti-Catholic societies, and a renegade priest, along with Miss Reed's narrative of her escape from a convent, and Maria Monk, until they were really afraid to go home after dark by themselves, but like 'burning and shining lights,' as they were of the church, each man carried a large glass lantern in one had, and brandished in the other a stout cudgel. I never could divine of what they were afraid, from that day to this, unless it was of a superannuated old couple who lived in the village, and were the only Catholics in it. I verily believe," said Mrs. Talmadge, sadly, "these incidents led to my husband's death finally; for he never recovered entirely from the fever into which they threw him, but declined gradually in health until he died. You may easily imagine, Mr. Clavering, what my first impressions of the Catholic religion were, from the little circumstances which I have just related; indeed, I sincerely thought it far, very far beneath that of Mahomet. In some of the papers which I still received from Baltimore, I saw the merits of many literary institutions highly eulogized, and determined, after my estate was settled up, to remove thither. A brother of my deceased husband resided in the city, and to him I entrusted the investment of my money, and the purchase of a suitable residence, and in a few months we were delightfully situated in my new abode, and my children in the full enjoyment of all those sources of knowledge which a sound and refined education requires. Several weeks after our arrival were very agreeably occupied in riding and walking about to

see the various lions of the city; in fact, you know that every thing in a large and populous city must have presented a novel and delightful contrast to the dull routine of a rustic village life, and, I assure you, my young people enjoyed it with unrestrained zest. I was frequently asked, 'Have you visited the cathedral?' The cathedral indeed! thought I, not for the world would I enter beyond the precincts of its enclosure! *I was afraid.* I fancied I knew a little too much about its trap-doors, and vaults, and subterranean passages, where the pale and wandering ghosts of incarcerated men and women were to be seen gliding along in ghostly procession, performing their midnight penance. I had read all these things in the 'Orthodox Organ,' so don't think I am exaggerating, Mr. Clavering, don't I beg of you, for I detest exaggeration as much as I do untruth; it is the self-same principle after all, only in a greater or lesser degree, which gives rise to both; those villainous pamphlets, those newspapers teeming with abhorrent falsehoods, all sanctified by being the official organs of certain denominations, actually warped my mind to that degree, that no imagination, however horrible, concerning the Catholic religion, and every thing connected with it, would have seemed at all preposterous. But, woman like, I began at last to feel a sneaking kind of a curiosity to go within the walls of this church, of whose beauty and grandeur I had also heard, and, after much persuasion, determined to accompany Mr. Lindsay, a gentleman with whom my eldest son was studying law. I do not precisely remember the year in which all this happened, or the exact date of my first visit to a Catholic church. It was, let me see, 1827—1829—no; but never mind, it was during the time of the excellent Archbishop W———. But, Mr. Clavering, you are fatigued! My poor husband used to say to me sometimes, 'Jane, my dear, you have discovered the secret of perpetual motion;' for then, as now, when I began to talk, I had no prudential considerations for my listener's ears."

"I assure you, madam, I feel much interested in your little narrative, and am anxious to hear of your first visit to a Catholic church," replied Clavering.

"Well, it was a dark winter's day, the very clouds seemed to have descended and saturated every thing with their reeking dampness as they rolled in heavy masses along the streets. As Mr. Lindsay and myself were ascending the steps, the first note of the second vesper bell pealed! I thought I was shot! and was so mad at being scared out of my wits by a bell, that I did not wish to proceed farther, but Mr. Lindsay prevailed, and in we walked. But it was solemn!—the far off tapers—the reverberating and rejoicing music, the kneeling multitude. I forgot in an instant all the mysterious tales I had ever heard about papists, until he whispered that he could obtain a seat for me near the altar. 'Not for the world,' I replied in an under tone, all my fears reviving at once; 'we will sit here,' and I went into one of the last pews in the middle aisle. I did not sit down. I was afraid, and thought I would keep my feet ready for a start, in case any thing extraordinary occurred. After gazing furtively around, and seeing that no one disappeared suddenly under ground, I began to feel more composed, and disposed to enjoy the scene. I looked with amazement at the altar, and noticed with a feeling akin to pity, the strange costume of the priest, and the throwing up of incense, and bowing to a figure before him, and exclaimed to myself: 'they are joined to their idol's,' and was wondering which of the saints it could be to whom so much attention was paid; for to me, who had never seen any thing of the kind before, it looked quite outlandish enough to be either St. Peter or St. Paul, or any other saint that flourished in the olden time, when all on a sudden, while through the distance and evening gloom my wondering eyes were magnifying it out of all possible human proportions, up it rose, and stood, and moved its head around, while every body in the church immediately sprang to their feet, and off I started, making my way with all possible speed to the door, for I thought a crisis had arrived, and that a general onset was to be made.* Mr. Lindsay followed me instantly, thinking that I was taken suddenly ill, and when he overtook me, as I was rapidly descending the steps, exclaimed: 'For God's sake, madam, what is the matter? you look pale, here lean on my arm.'

"'Hush, hush,' said I in a hoarse whisper; 'hurry on, or we shall be blown up; hurry on, hurry on.'

"'What can be the matter?' he again asked,

* A fact.

looking much alarmed; I believe he thought that a violent fit of insanity had seized me; 'Mrs. Talmadge, what can have agitated you so? what have you seen?'

"'Seen! I have seen priestcraft and wickedness.'

"'My dear madam, what under the sun are you raving about? On my veracity I can not comprehend——'

"'Raving, do you call it? raving, sir? Didn't you see with your own eyes that awful statue with the helmet on its head suddenly rise to its feet, like a human being, and, at the signal, every body in the church was up, ready for any thing?'

"Well, he laughed, and laughed, and finally roared out. 'It was the good archbishop!' and laughed again, 'and the congregation stood while they sang the magnificat.'

"'Come,' said I, 'cat me no cats about it; I have had quite enough of it; I don't enter *that* door again, that's all; they can get along vastly well without my assistance.'"

"How did it happen, Mrs. Talmadge," inquired Clavering, who had been much amused, "that you ever ventured to approach again?"

"Why thus: Mr. Lindsay became a Catholic soon after, and my son in the course of a year or two, during which time he read unceasingly those books which misrepresented Catholicism and represented her in her own pure and heavenly colors, and, after comparing both, found, as he energetically expressed himself, that he must either be a Catholic heart and soul or an infidel. Gradually, and by very slow degrees, I was induced to read, and the pious example of my son, together with the well-selected books——but see, we are about being interrupted."

As the door opened, and a broad, red, good-humored face was thrust in, surmounted by a head which was covered by short curls of thick yellow hair, Mrs. Talmadge said to the intruder: "What, Barney! back again?"

"An thin may the angils thimselves make ye a bed in hiven, my lady!"

"Did you get work, sir?"

"Sorra a bit. The whole world seems to be fixt up all at once, quite independent like."

"Astonishing," said Mrs. Talmadge, laughing.

"And I've been a thinking," he continued, crushing his tattered hat between his hands, "that as ther is sich a bother for a poor boy in Baltimore, I'd lave it altogether intirely, and go beyant to Aistern shore, and never come back to Ameraky agin, for it aint by no manes the place it is cracked up to be at all, at all."

"Well, Barney," said Mrs. Talmadge, "you must go out again and try for work in some part of the city which is not so well fixed up as this, and, if you do not succeed, return to me, and, perhaps I can find something to employ you."

"Manewhile, me lady, iv the sowl ov me is starved out ov me body intirely; niver a bit will Barney want the labor thin," he answered, looking wistfully at a covered plate and bowl that sat at the fire, and, winking his eye and smacking his lips with an indescribable and graphic indication of hunger.

"Have you had no breakfast, Barney," enquired Mrs. Talmadge.

"Sorra a bit has gone in me teeth to-day."

"Truth now, Barney."

"As thrue as the Gospils, me lady."

"Well, I suppose you must have something, come here. Mr. Clavering you'll excuse my giving him his breakfast here? There, sit down, here is a breakfast for a king," said Mrs. Talmadge, as she raised the bowl and plate, the contents of which had been designed for her son who had not yet come in to his morning meal. He made his benefactress a low reverence, and fell too with right good will on the inviting meal of coffee, rich toast, and broiled ham, so temptingly set before him. One or two infirm old women now came in to whom the good lady gave some articles of coarse, substantial, and warm winter clothing, and to a modest nice little girl some tea, coffee, and sugar, and a small quantity of wine, all of which she packed away in a clean willow basket that hung on her arm. Barney revelled meanwhile in his unexpected luxuries, and rolling his eyes around on the recipients of Mrs. Talmadge's bounty, exclaimed with all the enthusiasm of his warm-hearted nation, "An' sure it is I've been translated widout knowin it at all, at all, from airth to hiven! Ah! me, if the poor craythur was only here!" Mrs. Talmadge did not hear him, but Clavering did, and, feeling an interest in the good humored fellow's welfare, determined to find out his history, for he, like the generality of mankind, was a physiognomist, and had dis-

covered in his countenance an expression of honesty and indomitable cheerfulness which penury and mayhap want had failed to quench, and then his involuntary exclamation about his absent relative, all convinced him that there was something behind the scenes worth finding out; so whispering Barney to wait without until he came, was about making his adieu, when his attention was directed to a new comer by an exclamation from Mrs. Talmadge. He was a heavily built old Dutchman, and stood in the doorway, leaning on a stick, looking doggedly around on the inmates of the room. His clothing was coarse and poor, but patched and darned with every variety of color until the original hue of his garments had become a difficult problem; his hat remained untouched, and no token save a sound between a grunt and a growl evinced a recognition of any individual present. "What on earth conjured you up, Carl," asked Mrs. Talmadge; "is old Frederika sick?"

"Yaw!"

"How long has she been sick, Carl, and what ails her?"

"Mien vrow hash got te bains in her legs, te bains in her arms, and te bains in her pack," he replied, looking as immovable as ever.

"Good old Frederika, I hope she is not going to die."

"Me cant tell dat. She says you musht sent her von of dem Plessed Firgin metals, and bray for her, ugh! ugh! ugh!" he exclaimed, after delivering his almost unintelligible message, and giving vent to those sounds of contempt, as if by them he made satisfaction to his own philosophic mind for having been the bearer of a message concerning things which he detested. Old Carl, like many others in this world of ours, was a nondescript in religion, he believed just what suited his own notions and chimed in with his idea of creature comforts.

"Sir," said Mrs. Talmadge, sharply, "what do you mean by your ugh, ugh? Better wear a medal yourself, old gray-headed sinner, and ask the Blessed Virgin to pray for you—better do this, old Carl, than when you come to die repent when it is too late."

"Vell," said he, unmoved, "dish vorld ish goot enuff fer me, so long ash I can get a shup of peer and von goot pipe to shmoke."

"Old reprobate, do you think you will live always?"

"I hope to liff till I can't shee, till I can't hear, till I can't valk, and till I can't feel not no more all ofer, den I vill die and not know noting apout it."

"You do," answered Mrs. Talmadge, quite exasperated, "you do! Perverse man! your soul at least can never die or wear out, either here or hereafter, and our God lives for ever. You will be banished from his presence, Carl, and from the presence of the angels and all the heavenly hosts if you do not pray day and night, for you are very old, and time is so short with you that there is but a step between you and eternity."

"Mien Gott! don't I tell you dish vorld ish goot enuff for Carl? What if te goot Lord would say 'come up now, Carl, and pe von angel?' Vell! tell me, vill you, what goot vould it pe to be settin on a vet cloud all tay singing hallelujahs! so now—dere!" he exclaimed, stamping out in a towering passion. Clavering could but smile at the old man's unpoetical appreciation of the employments of the heavenly hosts, but felt at the same time deeply grieved at the state of morbid insensibility into which the obstinate Carl had fallen, and, uttering a short prayer in his behalf, bade Mrs. Talmadge good morning, and hastened out to keep his engagement with Barney.

TO BE CONTINUED.

INTELLIGENCE.

FOREIGN.

(From our Irish Correspondent.)

IRELAND.—*Maynooth College.*—Every friend of Ireland and Catholicity on your side of the Atlantic will, I am sure, be rejoiced to hear that the British government has recently increased the annual grant to this most useful ecclesiastical institution. The endowment was formerly only the scanty sum of nine thousand pounds per annum, to which has been added seventeen thousand three hundred, exclusive of three thousand seven hundred which is to be appropriated to repair the present buildings, and to enlarge the college.

Those only who are acquainted with the spirit of bigotry, prejudice, and blind fanaticism which actuate all ranks of people in England, and Scotland, and the Protestant portion of Ireland, can have an adequate conception of the violent and obstinate resistance that was evinced against the enactment of this bill by their representatives. But petitions, remonstrances, clamors, and threats were in vain and futile, all were forced to yield to the strong arm of necessity. The discussion continued for three or four weeks, and the British House of Commons has been seldom the theatre of a more dreadful contest of intellects. The ungrounded apprehension of the ascendancy of "popery" instigated on one side the myrmidons of tyranny, bigotry, falsehood, and persecution, in spite of every consideration of public utility to oppose it, whilst the tools of Peel and the government were no less active and energetic in its support; hoping that they would be enabled by this mite of justice to conciliate Ireland; make her forget the accumulated wrongs and injuries of the past; secure her co-operation in case impending war should break out; wean the attachment of the hierarchy from the people and repeal; and sow the seeds of discord and dissension throughout the land. But how grossly have thay not deceived themselves! Even the wily minister, with all his artifice and duplicity, has been duped on this occasion. For never had Ireland such ground for hope and speedy success—her people were never more ardently and strongly attached to the legitimate and sacred cause in which they are struggling—more wedded to their great and peerless leader—more determined to cling to his councils, until the grand and darling object of his countless labors and exertions shall be achieved. It is true, the priesthood and Catholic portion of Ireland have hailed this compulsory donation with feelings of joy and gratitude, but that either would relinquish their birth-right and the blessings of a legislative parliament for this "mess of pottage," it is an utter impossibility, and a foolish and chimerical idea, which could be only entertained by those who are unacquainted with the Irish character. The grant will, no doubt, be productive of much advantage both to the inmates of the college, and the great mass of the people. It will remove the embarrassments in which the trustees of the college were heretofore frequently involved, owing to the inadequacy of the former grant from government to the defraying the expenses of so large a number of students. The intention of the government is also, it appears, to prolong the philosophical and theological course of the pupils two years. Their physical comforts and convenience will be likewise more attended to, and their condition in every respect immensely ameliorated. The students comprise three distinct classes. The first consists of those who pay twenty-five pound per annum for their maintenance and tuition: second, of those who are supported and educated by the annual grant; and the third, those of the Dunboyne establishment. The usual number of students, these last twenty years, has averaged at four hundred and twenty, which is much larger than the college could maintain by the former annual grant and individual bequests, accordingly many of the students were admitted as pensioners, or half pensioners, and even some free of all expense, excepting eight pounds to be paid on admittance. The college, in its present state, is capable of accommodating only about four hundred and fifty, but when the additions that are being made shall have been completed, it will be enabled, without the least incumbrance, to receive five hundred. This will be a most desirable object and advantage, as the number of clergymen will be thus greatly augmented throughout the kingdom, which requires for its Catholic population many more than it now possesses. The pupil's uniform consists of a cap and gown, which are similar to those worn by the Dublin university students.

The college is divided into three compartments—the junior, senior, and Dunboyne establishments. The present annual endowment will provide the two former divisions with maintenance and education free of all expense, whilst the sum of forty pounds being added to the thirty pounds which the

students of the Dunboyne house formerly received, it will render their position an object of laudable emulation to the other pupils of the college—hold forth a powerful incitement to assiduous literary and theological exertion, and no inconsiderable remuneration for industry. This body of students is confined to twenty, who are chosen from the various diocesses in the country in the same proportion generally as the free students. The professors of the institution are most frequently selected from them, being all persons of superior accomplishments, and particularly distinguished for their eminent talents and extensive knowledge in the respective studies, and more especially in theology. Each student undergoes a rigid examination before the board of trustees previous to his admission. The college is under the direction of a president, vice-president, senior dean, and two junior deans, and a bursar, besides professors of dogmatical and moral theology, Sacred Scripture, Hebrew, natural philosophy, logic, metaphysics and ethics, belles lettres, rhetoric, humanity, latin and Greek, and of Irish. The Revd. Mr. Keenan bequeathed a thousand pounds for the establishment of an Irish professorship, and much to the credit of the institution, be it said, that the Irish language is in a high state of cultivation and improvement, and regarded as a requisite attainment to perfect the Maynooth student's education. Indeed, it is indispensable almost for the ministry, considering that it is still the language spoken by a large portion of the inhabitants of this country. The buildings of the college form three sides of a quadrangle, and are favorably situated about eleven miles from Dublin, in a secluded and salubrious section of the county Kildare. The library contains about ten thousand volumes, exclusive of a large and most beautiful collection (of the finest works in modern and ancient literature and science), which was added to it by the late Dr. Boylan, former superior of the Irish college in Rome. It is erected on the Duke of Leinster's domain, and was first opened for the reception of students in 1795, by an act of the Irish parliament. Previous to this period, your readers are aware that the Catholic priesthood of Ireland were educated on the continent, but in consequence of the lamentable war that was then raging, all intercourse was obliged to be suspended. There are attached to the college fifty-four acres, which are allotted to the use of the students in their hours of relaxation and amusement. Such is a hasty and faint description of this seat of piety and learning, where the majority of the exemplary and devoted missionaries of our holy faith in Ireland have been instructed in the divine precepts of the Gospel—and have imbibed the saving maxims of truth and religion; which has exhibited the brightest ornaments of the church in this country, and which will, there is every reason to expect, by the aid of the recent munificent and liberal endowment from government, be enabled to confer still greater and more abundant blessings on the ingenuous, hospitable, chivalrous, and religious people of Ireland. The most gratifying circumstance (I should have observed) connected with the government grant, and which is a source of the greatest joy and delight to those for whom it is intended to benefit, is that the state does not interfere with the established order and discipline of the college. On any other conditions, the endowment would not be merely objectionable, but would have necessarily been rejected and repudiated. The government has, also, a short time since introduced a bill for establishing three other colleges in the north, south and west of Ireland. The plan of education and system of collegiate discipline have been disapproved of, and decried with the utmost abhorrence and indignation by all the bishops, the whole body of the priesthood, and, I may say, by the entire Catholic laity of the nation. This unanimous decision and irresistible opposition, have even at present almost gloriously frustrated the delusive schemes and insidious designs of the government, and it is rumored that they have abandoned it as impracticable. The state intended to amalgamate the three colleges into a university; not to allow the students to reside or be supported in the colleges, but in the adjoining towns; to permit them to be opened to persons of every creed and denomination. The tenth clause of the bill was, perhaps of all, the most intolerable and adverse to the interests and wishes of the people, whereby it invested all power in the hands of the government, with regard to discipline and the appointment of professors. The sons of Erin, amongst whom the numerous readers of your invaluable Magazine form so large a portion, will be overjoyed to perceive by this, and every intelligence from Ireland, that the English government has been (reluctantly indeed, it is true,) compelled to take into consideration the doleful condition of this unfortunate and impoverished country; that her political position with foreign powers, particularly with America—the domestic discontent and disaffection which pervade all ranks of her subjects in England and Scotland, and the more than human power and moral strength of the repeal agitation, which is every day becoming more potent—more formidable to British tyranny and injustice, has at last necessitated her to mete out a paltry share of those rights which she has long withheld, to her disgrace and eternal ignominy. Still, it is heart-gladdening and delightful to mark the rapid, gigantic, and onward strides which Ireland is making towards independence; the happy and almost miraculous reformation which has taken place within these last few years amongst all grades

of society, in consequence of temperance—the enlightenment and unequalled morality of her people—the warm and unabated devotedness which they show towards their illustrious and incomparable champion, and the unshaken earnestness and unswerving determination they evince in the righteous and sympathizing cause of liberty, to which his protracted and toilsome life has been exclusively dedicated, are auspicious harbingers of hope and cheering presages that the day is not far distant when the galling chains with which her inhuman and relentless sister riveted and bound her, shall be burst—that her proud flag will be again seen floating in every breeze—her name inscribed amongst the nations of the earth, and her noble, gallant, and patriotic sons free and independent. There is also another celebrated literary and Catholic college in this county, and about five miles from Maynooth, which is under the management and control of the Jesuits. It is beautifully situated in a picturesque and delectable section of the country, and is known by the name of Clongowes Wood college, the former residence of Wogan Browne, Esq. In 1814, it was opened by the Rev. and much lamented Mr. Kenney, and has since enjoyed a much larger share of public patronage than any other similar institution in Ireland. I feel the utmost pleasure and satisfaction in being able to apprise your transatlantic Catholics that the iniquitous, odious, and intolerable "Bequests Bill," which was, and is so vehemently and justly decried, and spurned here, will, there is every reason to hope, be abrogated or at least remodelled during the present session of parliament; otherwise, petitions will issue from every diocess in the land, calling upon the prelates who are commissioners, to abandon this execrable and pernicious bill, to resign their office as commissioners, and thus restore unanimity, concord, and peace to the Irish Catholic church. R. R.

GERMANY.—*The Rongian Schism in Germany.*—Though we have already called attention to this subject, the following details, which we have selected from the *Boston Tablet*, will be read with interest.

"Much has of late been written in this country on the *New German Catholic Church.* The Protestant presses have teemed with abuse of the *superstitions of popery* that gave rise to it. The very pulpits have resounded with furious declamations against that *senseless worship which adores a so-called garment of Christ.* Ronge has been canonized by men who despise the petty invocations of the mother of the Saviour, of the apostles, of the martyrs, of the confessors, and of the virgins who suffered for Christ, or who for him practised all the virtues even to a degree of heroism. He has been called an apostle, suscitated like Luther of old, to reform a corrupt church. In a word, the preaching of Ronge and Co. has been heralded from Maine to Texas, as a mark of the protection of the Lord, as a proof of his vigilance for the safeguard of Bible truths, as a forerunner of the final downfall of popery. And yet, *strange to say!* our good old father, Gregory, is still seated on the throne of St. Peter, the church daily opens her arms to receive new children into her bosom, the east and the west, and the isles and the dry land, send their embassadors to acknowledge the authority of the successor of him to whom were given, by the Master, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that whatever he might loose on earth should also be loosed in heaven, and that what he might bind on earth should be bound in heaven. What then is this astonishing *reformation* so much spoken of, and yet which has done so little? Who are the apostles of this new *church?* These questions, and many others which naturally arise, are fully answered by the *Ami de la Religion*, from which we translate the following article *on the so-called German Catholic Schism, its origin and phases up to the present day:*

"Every body knows that the great manifestation of faith, produced in Germany by the pilgrimage to Treves, filled German Protestantism with astonishment, and inspired it with the idea of a new and more severe attack against the Catholic church. The glory and the strength of Catholicism are in the *unity of faith;* the most terrible arm it opposes to Protestants are the innumerable dissidences that divide the heterodox sects, and which alone form an irrefragable argument against the impious doctrine of illimited freedom in interpreting and investigating in religious matters. This Protestantism knows, and in order to wrest from the hands of Catholicism that fatal arm, it has imagined the idea of forming communities infested with all the errors of the sixteenth century, and preserving the name of *Catholic*, though this holy and glorious denomination must necessarily exclude the title of *national* that they have also at the same time given to these new churches.

"This foolish attempt displays a profound ignorance of ecclesiastical history, as well as a reckless and culpable contempt of the divine principles on which Jesus Christ has founded his church. Who is there that knoweth not that faithful guardian of all revealed truths, the true spouse of Christ, preserves them, and to preserve them suffers even the painful loss of a part of her family? In the eleventh century she casts away from her a part of the east that dares to rebel against her and her apostolic supremacy. Nor did she hesitate, in the seventeenth century, rather to lose England and the north of Europe than suffer any derogation to the Catholic faith. How then could it be supposed that what she rejected with just horror at such a sacrifice, she would receive it from the impure hands of two unfortunate priests, who had already incurred her censures.

"At the epoch of the Protestant reformation Luther had also conceived the ambitious project of founding a *Germanic church*, of which he was to be the head, and which by its organization would, with Catholic unity, defy the supremacy of Rome. But Luther was, in erudition, and talents, and character, far superior to the miserable apostates who would resume his work, and make unto themselves a name like unto his. And yet he found rivals who partook of his supremacy before even it was solidly established. Something similar is taking place in the present schism. Ronge has scarce proclaimed in Germany his *German Catholic church*, when, in one of the eastern provinces, another apostate proclaims an *apostolic Catholic* church. They acted from a different principle, though they produced

the same identical effect; one obeyed the impulsion of hunger, the other satisfied the impure cravings of the flesh.

"Ronge, for holding heterodox opinions, had incurred the censures of the bishop to whose diocess he was attached. Suspended from all ecclesiastical functions, without knowledge, without talent, but feeling bitterly the misery of his nothingness, he secluded himself amidst the mountains of Siberia, and found an asylum in the house of the Protestant minister of Laurahiitte. There he languished, obscure and unknown, until a certain Count Reichenback, ultra-Protestant, whose temper had been singularly ruffled by the pilgrimage to Treves, and who was then seeking some Catholic theologian who would assume the publication of a libel against the holy relic, found, for money, a name-lender in the disgraced Ronge. Absurd and low as was this libel, yet it was above the capacity of Ronge; it had not even been written by Count Reichenback, but by a mixed society of Protestants, Evangelicals, and Rationalists. Ronge seized with equal avidity the sum proffered to him, and the opportunity of making unto himself a name in this anti-Catholic strife, and soon after was published, under his name, an infamous pamphlet, wherein it was blasphemously said that the holy robe of the Saviour was the property of murderers. This impious work revolted every Christian heart, and called down upon its apparent author and responsible editor, all the severity of the diocesan authority. They proceeded with canonic moderation, fixing unto him a peremptory term for a public retraction, under the threat of excommunication. Ronge refused to retract, and at the fixed time, he was publicly and solemnly cut off from the church. From that moment he became doubly dear to those who had dragged him into the abyss. The Protestant presses sang his praise, large sums of money and precious gifts were sent him from every part of Germany, his portrait was circulated through the country, and suddenly raised to be a great man, rival of the doctor of Wittemberg, he came and planted his standard in Breslau, where he had been publicly excommunicated; there, guided by his Protestant protectors, and secretly protected by the provincial government, he invited all those who were of his opinion to rally around him, and under his direction to constitute a *pseudo-Catholic* church.

"John Czersky, a priest of the diocess of Posen, at the same time, but from different causes, was entering the same iniquitous path. From a charity scholar, promoted (too soon) to the order of the priesthood, he shortly after, by his scandals of impurity, deserved to be interdicted from the pulpit and the altar. He was, however, restored on performing penance, and appointed curate of the parish of Schneidemiihl, a small town of the Prussian province of Bromberg. A new passion, and a sacrilegious *liaison*, to which he gave the name of *marriage of conscience*, renewed the scandal of Posen; cited before the metropolitan court, where he foresaw that illimited interdiction was unavoidable, he sought other means of existence, and followed by sixteen or twenty Catholics as corrupt as himself, he baptized his new church by the name of *Apostolic Catholic*. Interest and debauchery were then the double source of those two pretended Catholic schisms which now form but one. But though Czersky had incurred the same canonical censures as Ronge, their position was widely different. Ronge was enriched by the gifts of Germanic Protestantism, which even handed over to him the coffers of the Gustavo-Adolphian Society, founded for the apparent object of supporting the Protestant ministers of poor congregations; so much did they desire to expect and consolidate the pretended Catholic schism of Ronge and *his primatial church* founded at Breslau. His new situation enabled him to visit Leipsic, Dresden, Berlin, and a few other cities, where he acted as chief of his sect, and sought proselytes, of whom he found scarce a handful among Catholics, while the Protestant sects gave him many disciples who followed him, more through curiosity and a certain love for novelty, than for any real communion for religious opinions. And now came the tug of war between Ronge and Czersky. The first had the preponderance of fortune, for Czersky's appeals to public generosity had not procured him sufficient for his own wants and those of the offspring of his sacrilegious marriage. He had tried, it is true, to establish a creed for his followers wherein he only suppressed the celibacy of the clergy, the fasts and the abstinence prescribed by the church. Preserving the mass, he suppressed the dogma of the real presence, the liturgic language, the commemoration of the saints, ordered communion under both kinds, reduced the number of the sacraments to five, abolished auricular confession, and excluded or modified some articles of the apostles' creed, which he admitted as the sole exterior of faith, omitting, however, the resurrection of the flesh. But this formulary had to give way to that of Ronge, and Czersky soon discovered that the only chance of salvation for himself and his infant church was to unite with Ronge, and thus to obtain his portion of the loaves and fishes. He descended, therefore, from the patriarchal throne, and become an humble acolyte of Ronge, to whose authority he submitted with his small flock. Ronge received him, and dragged him in triumph through all the capitals he visited; but as chief of the new church, he secured unto himself the administration of the temporal goods, which Protestant munificence continued to accumulate in his hands, and, as it is natural to such apostles, he kept the lion's part, and suffered his ancient rival to remain in a needy and precarious state.

"We give now the statistics of the two sects united into one, as published by the German papers. The clergy consists of *five* Catholic priests publicly degraded and excommunicated, Ronge, Czersky, Licht, ex-vicar of the diocess of Treves, Kerbler, ex-curate of Breslau, and Schreiber, ex-professor of theological knowledge at Friburg in Brisgan. As by a strange anomaly these self-styled Catholics deemed necessary the sacerdotal character as conferred by the true church, as for the perpetuation thereof they needed a bishop, they cast their eyes on a prelate from whose antecedents they might have some hopes of success. The baron of Wessenberg having manifested great attachment to M. de Dalberg, prince-primate of the Rhine Confederation, and grand duke of Frankfort, was rewarded by the prelate, who, in an excess of extravagant friendship, consecrated him suffragan bishop of his diocess without apostolical letters or episcopal assistance. After the fall of the political edifice, M. de Wessenberg obtained from the grand duke of Baden the bishopric of Constance, of which see he took possession by main strength and with the help of the military, notwithstanding the apostolical censures. A friend to all new and lax doctrines, he was an ultra partisan of Frebronianism and of the Josephine system. He now lives retired at Friburg in Bris-

gau or at Constance, on a pension which he receives from the Baden government. We know not whether he has made his peace with the apostolic see; but this we know, that the request made by the innovators to confer on Ronge the episcopal consecration was rejected with indignation by M. de Wessenberg, who declared that, however he might have erred in disciplinary reform, his faith ever had been and ever would be dear to him above all.

"The small communities that have adhered to this schism amount to thirty or forty, and, as we have already remarked, the majority is composed of Protestants. But the Germans in general begin to discover that it is a mistake to encourage a club of Jacobins under the name of a new church. Robert Blum, the founder of the new church in Saxony, has lately developed in two public lectures the levelling theories of *rationalism* and *communism*. Religious indifference, so convenient for the rich and the wealthy, is not well calculated to excite the enthusiasm of the people who often know not how to procure the necessaries of life, and the day is not far distant when it will be made apparent that the Ronges and the Czerskies are but automata, and tools put in motion and employed by the unknown chiefs of illuminism, that style themselves Young Europe, and, on Germanic soil, Young Germany. By late news from Berlin, we see the Rongian schism obliged to receive in its bosom many neophytes from the Protestant churches; among others the entire Protestant congregation of Sturgard, with their ministers, have passed over to the new church. The Prussian government in seeking to introduce a principle of dissolution in the Catholic church, finds out but too late that its own pet evangelical church is the sole sufferer. With the government it now rests to see how to neutralize the effects of this cancer, which may end by eating up the religious and national establishment formed and established with such difficulty, and at the cost of much money, and with the loss of much affection."—*Boston Tablet.*

France.—*The Jesuits.*—The following is extracted from the *National:*

"Shortly after the vote of the chamber of deputies, relative to religious congregations, M. Martin du Nord, the minister of justice, had sent for the celebrated preacher, Father Ravignan, and endeavored to reason him into acquiescence in the desire of the assembly, and to prevail upon him to consent to a compromise which would satisfy the clergy and place his own responsibility under cover. The minister represented to M. Ravignan that 'after the decision of the chamber, he could no longer wink at the existence of unauthorized religious communities;' that 'his zeal for the interests of the church gave him a right to expect that the clergy would assist him in a proposition so delicate,' and 'that he relied on his co-operation to induce the congregation in the Rue des Postes to dissolve itself and join the great body of the clergy.' M. Ravignan replied to M. Martin, that if, as a minister, he was obliged to abide by the decisions of the legislature, the pious cenobites of that community were under obligations to the holy see, to religion, and to themselves, far more sacred than worldly interests, and that they could not acquiesce in any such terms. The discussion becoming warmer by degrees, M. Martin threatened to have recourse to the administrative measures recommended by the chamber, when Father Ravignan declared to him that 'the Jesuits of the Rue des Postes were determined to wait the result, and yield only to the power of bayonets."

The bishop of Chartres, in a letter to the minister of public worship, dated May 19th, 1845, upon closing a powerful vindication of this order, thus expresses himself in relation to their expulsion from France. "I know, Monsieur le Ministre, that many archbishops and bishops have given you to understand that, if the Jesuits are driven from their homes, they themselves will throw open to them their own domiciles, and make them their asylums. As I see in these prelates nothing but piety, as I recognise them as zealous auxiliaries worthy of my respect, I beg leave to assure you that I shall at all times esteem it a source of pride to be able to imitate the example they have set me." After speaking of their immense services and sacrifices in behalf of Christianity, and repelling the imputation of their being a dangerous society, he asks: "What pernicious effects, what poison will befall France from the literary teaching of that company which has trained the mind of a Bossuet, a Fenélon, the great Condé, Descarte, the two Corneilles, Cassini, Huet, Bourdaloue, Pierre de Marca, the Cardinal Polignac, and a very great number of other celebrated and eminent men?"

Syria.—The news from Syria is most distressing. A civil war is raging in the Lebanon—a war of extermination. The Druses and the Christians have been slaughtering each other without regard to age or sex. Towns, churches, and public as well as private institutions of all kinds have been destroyed. Eleven villages were on fire at the same hour. The convents of the Maronites and Catholics have not been spared in this general destruction.—*Cath. Tel.*

False Alarms.—It would seem that the evangelical missioners and colporteurs completely forget the moral contained in the fable of the naughty shepherd and the wolf. It is a dangerous experiment for the Bible distributers to overtax the credulity of their liberal supporters. As long as they confine themselves to hopes, promises and prospects of success, it is all very well; but when they come to the statement of facts, pecuniary considerations should dictate a wiser policy than that of some thoughtless missionaries who, in order to magnify the importance of their labors, or to exact considerable sums for the support of *invisible* churches and congregations, send the most astonishing reports of imaginary conversions to Protestantism in Catholic countries. "Wonderful stories," says the *Catholic Telegraph*, "have been circulated of the extraordinary effects produced amongst the people of France by the circulation and reading of the Holy Bible! Fancy sketches have been published of the surprise and gratitude evinced by the poor papists when they received a Bible for the first

time! They had never seen the book until the evangelical Quixotte from afar, moved by his commiseration for the benighted Catholic, presented him with one from his cargo! It is necessary to keep up at home the noisy machinery by which the reformed religion is fashioned; and to raise the funds to preserve it in perpetual motion, the imagination is busy in the concoction of extraordinary stories, by which the dupes are encouraged to persevere in their false charity. An instance of this kind is fresh in the recollection of our readers. The sectarian papers circulated far and wide a narrative of the conversion of forty communes in France, where priests and people walked over in a body to the ranks of the reformers. This slander made its first appearance in the London Herald. The earl of Shrewsbury forwarded a copy of the Herald to the bishop in whose diocess the conversions were said to have occurred, and the bishop sent the following reply: 'Monsieur, I am happy to be able to tell you that not one priest, not one parish of the diocess of Angouleme has had the misfortune to abjure the Catholic faith: what has been observed in this respect by an English journal is a most perfect falsehood. The number of Protestants does not exceed three thousand in the department of the Charente, and every year I have the consolation of seeing many of them return to the faith of their fathers, and again enter into the bosom of the church. Even last Sunday, in the church of Legansac, I received the abjuration of three of these newly converted. I am, with respectful consideration, monsieur, your very humble servant, ✠R. F., bishop of Angouleme.'"

DOMESTIC.

Diocess of Boston.—*Confirmation.*—On Saturday, 21st June, the festival of St. Aloysius, patron of Christian youth, the sacrament of confirmation was administered by the Rt. Rev. Dr. Fitzpatrick, in the chapel of the college of the Holy Cross, Worcester, to thirty-three persons, twenty-nine of whom are students of the institution.—*Boston Tablet.*

On Sunday, July 6th, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Fitzpatrick administered the sacrament of confirmation in the church at Salem to about sixty persons.—*Ibid.*

Diocess of Providence.—*Confirmation.*—The sacrament of confirmation was administered in St. Patrick's church, Providence, on the 1st of June, by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Tyler, to seventy persons, mostly children.—*Boston Pilot.*

Diocess of New York.—*Confirmation.*—Sunday, the 15th of June, proved a day full of interest and instruction to the flourishing congregation of the church of the Most Holy Redeemer, situated on Thirtieth street, in the upper part of New York city.

Nearly two hundred persons, among whom were several converts—(they had been prepared during the five preceding weeks, two instructions being given each week)—received the holy communion, at the seven o'clock mass, from the hands of the pastor of the church, Rev. Gabriel Rumpler, C. S. R.

At the eight o'clock mass confirmation was administered by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Hughes, preceded by a short instruction to those who had previously received the communication.—*Freem. Journal.*

Diocess of Richmond.—*Ordination.*—On Sunday, the 25th instant, Rt. Rev. Dr. Whelan held an ordination in his cathedral in Richmond, on which occasion Messrs. Charles Farrell and Austin Grogan were raised to the dignity of deaconship, having been ordained subdeacons on the previous Saturday. On the 1st of June the same gentlemen were to be ordained priests.

Diocess of Cincinnati.—*Ordination.*—At the request of the Rt. Rev. Bishop O'Connor, Bishop Purcell conferred the ecclesiastical tonsure and four minor orders on Mr. John Hoy, of the diocess of Pittsburg, on Sunday, 15th June. On Sunday, 22d June, the same gentleman was ordained subdeacon; on Tuesday, feast of St. John Baptist, he was ordained deacon, and on Sunday morning, 29th June, he will, God willing, be ordained priest by the same prelate.—*Cath. Telegraph.*

Diocess of Louisville.—*Dedication.*—Last Sunday, the 15th of June, the new church of Corpus Christi, in Newport, Kentucky, was consecrated by the Rev. J. A. Elet, superior of the Society of Jesus in Cincinnati, assisted by several priests of that city, and some scholastics of his order. After the ceremony, he addressed the congregation in an English sermon. After high mass, which was sung by Rev. M. E. Olivetti, Rev. A. Tusch, of St. Mary's church, in Cincinnati, preached in German. A large concourse of Catholics and Protestants were present, but the weather being rather unfavorable, many that intended to witness this significant ceremony were prevented. This church, which, however, is not yet entirely finished, is of brick, fifty-five feet long, thirty-three feet wide, from the floor to the ceiling twenty-four feet high. The lot of ground whereon it stands is a donation of Messrs. Goodman and Gould, both Protestants, and to the liberality of Catholic friends in Kentucky and Ohio it is due that this church has been erected in a place where but few Catholics were supposed to reside. Their number, however, now exceeds two hundred, and is daily increasing. Several stations are attached to this mission.—*Cath. Ad.*

Diocess of New Orleans.—*The Funeral Obsequies.*—A portion of the public press, ready to carp at and misunderstand every thing connected with the Catholic and his church, has had the ingenuity to make a "mountain from a mole-hill" in

reference to a circumstance connected with the late funeral obsequies of Gen. Andrew Jackson at New Orleans.

We take our explanation of the circumstances from *Le Propagateur Catholique* of the 21st June, just received.

It seems the committee to take charge of the funeral obsequies in honor of the deceased General, called upon the Rt. Rev. Bishop Blanc, of New Orleans, with a request that he would cause the religious funeral ceremonial to take place at the cathedral of that city, evidently referring to a solemn *mass ad requiem.* The prelate, of course, declined, as, according to the most positive ecclessiastical discipline, religious ceremonies for the dead can not have for their object one not a Catholic; as every church or persuasion has its own laws and rules of discipline, which are fixed and determinate. The course of the bishop was plain in the premises. The committee, it seems, then demanded that the funeral sermon, or eulogy, should be allowed by Bishop Blanc to take place in the cathedral. Apart from the very evident impropriety and unusual nature of the last request, a compliance therewith was prevented by well known ecclesiastical rules upon the subject, re-enacted in the very last council at Baltimore, to the effect that all ceremonies in churches, other than religious services, are forbidden. The Rt. Rev. Bishop Blanc was therefore under the painful necessity of denying the requests of the committee of citizens.

It seems to us that it would have been about as reasonable for the Catholics to have demanded of the Presbyterians the performance of *their* funeral usages, if they have any, in memory of the late Charles Carroll, of Carrolton, as to demand of a Catholic bishop a solemn *mass ad requiem* for an individual dying a member of the Presbyterian church. As to employing a Catholic church for uses purely secular, as funeral orations, &c., it is a thing unheard of, and which would be refused in all cases, even to Catholics themselves.

A few New Orleans and some other journals have made use of the above circumstances, with the aid of convenient misrepresentations and suppressions of the truth, to manufacture quite an "anti-popery" or "native humbug," as they may choose to call it.

We will merely remark, in conclusion, that none have shown themselves more ready and patriotic in rendering funeral honors, apart from strictly religious services, to the departed hero, than the very Catholics who have been in the above case so profusely reviled.—*N. Y. Freem. Journal.*

Confirmation.—On the 22d of June, Rt. Rev. Dr. Blanc gave confirmation at the Ursuline convent, to sixty-three persons, twenty-three of whom were young ladies of the academy. On the 30th of the same month, sixty-three persons were confirmed at the church of St. Augustine.

Ordination.—On Wednesday, July 2d, Bishop Blanc conferred the holy order of priesthood on Mr. Adrian Rouquette, the first native of New Orleans who has been ordained since the union of Louisiana with the states.

IMAGE-WORSHIP IN CINCINNATI IN 1845.—The exclamation of Tertullian, "*O! Omnis anima naturaliter Christiana,*" is frequently brought to our minds by the homage rendered to Catholic truth, at unguarded moments, or certain lucid intervals, by sectarians. Yes! the God of the Catholic religion is the God of nature. The one bears testimony to the other, and we have only to silence the clamors of heresy and prejudice, to hear the echo of every Catholic doctrine, in the heart. How often has not our church been reproached with making "graven images," and the "likeness" of any of the Creator's works, and suppressing that portion of the commandments which is said to forbid such things, whereas it only forbids us to adore and worship them, with any portion of that honor which belongs to God alone. And after so many eloquent tirades against this idolatry, lo! the whole world is running to one Protestant church after another, in this fair city of ours, to see a picture of "Christ healing the sick." There it is, and there they stand, and gaze upon it. And here are shoals of Protestant editors countenancing the deadly sin, "compelling" the Protestant patrons "to enter" and inspect it, and borrowing the good old Catholic argument—"of the superiority of descriptive painting to written narrative," and "that the *impression of reality* produced by the contemplation of a picture of Christ's miracles, his sufferings and death is more vivid and intense, is deeper and more enduring, than even the pages of the Gospel can convey!" The fact is evident, but we marvel at the witnesses.

"The Christian Advocate says:—'Having beheld the painting, we can not but express our high admiration of its execution. The whole is natural and unspeakably impressive.

"We recommend all who delight in works of this kind, to give it an inspection, and a contemplation too, for it furnishes abundant matter for thought.

"It has already been exhibited in several of the leading cities of the Union, and excited the admiration of thousands.'

"The Watchman of the Valley says:—'The superiority of descriptive painting over written narrative consists in its power to impress on the mind the idea of reality—of life, to a degree of vividness and durability which the latter can not possess. This superiority will be discovered and felt by those who have read with the deepest interest the affecting narrative of Christ's miracles, as given in the New Testament, when they have looked upon this picture. Let them go and examine this work of the great artist whose name it bears, and they will re-

ceive an impression of reality which time can not erase.'

"Rev. Dr. Brisbane's Transcript says:—'I only know that some paintings produce intense *feeling* in my soul, whilst others, with the same figures, do not—and if all men had my taste or my *feeling*, the author of that picture, whoever he may be, would not need the name of West to give celebrity to his canvass and brush. If it be not West's execution, the artist whose it is must be one of the most modest of men. I can find faults in the work, but I have also found faults in what was certainly painted by West himself. I rather guess that those artists who condemn, would gain reputation by making an exact copy from the Messrs. Morris' picture—*if they can.*'

"The Herald says:—'We might proceed with this examination, but it is needless. Let every man who would transport himself for an hour or two to Jerusalem, to the feet of Jesus, and feel himself among the wondering crowd that attended on his miracles, go and see this picture for himself.'"—*Cath. Telegraph.*

Merited Rebuke.—The New York *Sabbath Recorder*, in noticing the amusing character which the late decision of the Presbyterian assembly bears in the estimation of the Catholic and Episcopalian bodies, and of all who can justly lay claim to intelligence and liberality, winds up his remarks with the following mild yet significant reprimand:

"These facts are sufficient to show that a spirit of inquiry is awake in regard to the questions at issue between Catholics and Protestants, which will not be put down by the mere *ipse dixit* of any body of men, however orthodox in their own estimation. The decisions of such ecclesiastical bodies as the assembly will be tried by the avowed principles and practices of the men who compose these bodies. If, after all their pretensions of adherence to the Scriptures, they will, without a text of Scripture, unchurch a large portion of those who claim to be a part of the church as much as themselves, they must expect to be referred to their own professions. If, notwithstanding their charges against the Baptists of bigotry and uncharitableness, they carry out the very same principle, how can they expect to escape the censure which they have so liberally heaped upon others? For our own part we are glad to see the discussion going on. We hope it may lead to greater watchfulness and consistency on the part of those who undertake to condemn others."

New Churches.—New churches have been commenced at *Hardensburg*, Ky., and at *Peoria*, Illinois.

Extent of the Oregon Territory.—On the east it skirts eight hundred miles along the Rocky Mountains, on the south three hundred miles along the Snowy Mountains, on the west seven hundred miles along the Pacific ocean, on the north two hundred and fifty miles along the North American possessions of Russia and England. This area or immense valley contains three hundred and sixty thousand square miles—capable undoubtedly of forming seven states as large as New-York, or forty states of the dimensions of Massachusetts. Some of the islands on the coast are very large—sufficient to form a state by themselves. These are situated north of the parallel of 48°. Vancouver's island, two hundred and sixty miles in length and fifty in breadth, contains twelve thousand square miles—an area larger than Massachusetts and Connecticut. Queen Charlotte's or rather Washington island, too, one hundred and fifty miles in length and thirty in breadth, contains four thousand square miles. On both of these immense islands, though they lie between the high parallels of forty-eight and fifty-four degrees, the soil is said to be well adapted to agriculture. The straits and circumjacent waters abound in fish of the finest quality. Coal of good quality, and other veins of minerals, have been found.

The Rt. Rev. F. N. Blanchette, vicar apostolic elect of Oregon, recently arrived in Canada by the way of England. It is expected that his consecration will take place shortly in Canada.

"Young Italy" and her American Allies.—We have heretofore had occasion to allude, more than once, to an extraordinary league, or society, calling itself the Christian Alliance, which originated in our midst, and has already excited some attention; more indeed than its *practical* history has merited. The chance allusion to it as the *Christian League* in the letter of his holiness warning the faithful against sundry of the sectarian and irreligious movements of the day, gave the *Alliance* a species of notoriety, which perhaps its own resources never could have drawn upon it, and which its members have not been slow in striving to take advantage of. The *Christian Alliance* is so far remarkable from its own intrinsic qualities, or at least professions, inasmuch as it differs in one essential point from most of those organizations which, for distinction's sake, may be called of the anti-popery order. The various tract, Bible, evangelical, and reform societies of that class generally confine their operations to attempts at sectarian proselytism in an innocent and most harmless way; making decidedly more noise than work, and principally objectionable, from the constant bickering and uneasy excitements which they keep up, and the amount of valuable money they annually waste. They, however, seldom, if ever, walk out of their well-beaten track to interfere with government, the political relations of states, police or law. The Christian Alliance has, in theory at least, a character not quite so harmless, and an object not so undeserving of animadversion and censure. That *Alliance* is indeed a politico-religious association, which departs from the common ranks of the other *leagues* we have alluded to, and seeks by new means to accomplish new objects and in a new way. Its political character, and the manifestations of such a character it has already made, are the unusual features of the *Christian Alliance*, which we deem obnoxious to the severest censure, as subversive of law, order, and that respect and de-

ference which as *Americans* we *owe* to the municipal and *police* regulations of *neutral* states at amity and upon terms of reciprocal friendship with the U. S.

We shall presently allude more definitely to these deformities of this new alliance.

The *Alliance* was first introduced to the public in its true features by the *Journal*. A correspondent, and one who had the luck to be somewhat behind the scenes, notified us of the birth of that society before the news of the event had travelled beyond the place of nativity. Again, we alluded to the new society, which, *like ill weeds*, had already *grown apace*, during November last, in connection with passages from a letter of the rather *notorious* Dr. Cheever, dated at Turin, Oct. 7, 1844.

A renewal of measures for the increase and advancement of the same project has again brought the subject to our attention. The ill success of the great tabernacle demonstration of last year, which our readers will all remember, and at which *the* Mr. Ketchum figured so largely, not by an exhibition of talent or learning, but in the position of a false witness, whose calumny was signally refuted on the spot: the ill success we say of that memorable effort threw cold water upon the exertions of the *allies* for a time. It will be recollected that, upon that occasion, notwithstanding the coaxing, wheedling, almost *driving*, tones of Mr. Ketchum and a host of *ministerial* assistants, and, although a hat was actually passed round, not a cent could be raised to *convert* Italy, and the meeting broke up in a state bordering on despair. They have recovered, however, from the severe shower-bath then administered to their *Quixotism*, and are again moving the elements in favor of their *Dulcinea*, the *Alliance*. They are calling to each other from all points of the compass. Meetings are being organized in sundry places. The spirit is moving many of the choicest spirits of the *Alliance* again to favor the public with exhibitions of their eloquence and taste. Dr. Bushnell of Hartford, who has lately returned from seeking recreation, &c., in the "old world," favored a congregation of our own metropolis very recently with a sermon on "Christian liberty viewed in connection with the origin, objects, practicability, and anticipated results of the association." The Rev. Leonard Bacon has also been delighting audiences, still later, with stirring appeals upon the same topic, in New Haven. Similar movements are taking place in other quarters.

Our object is now to deliver, in advance as it were, some few remarks, based upon reliable *data*, in reference to those *objects* which the members of the *Christian Alliance* are about, it seems, to reattempt. We wish again to lay before *our* readers and the public the character of that Alliance, and its true object.

We have already observed that the *Alliance* partakes of a political character, and is, in fact, a body with political aims and objects. This we can readily show, from the very constitution and address which were adopted at the organization of the body.

Article 2d of that constitution is as follows:

Article II.—The objects of the society shall be to promote religious freedom, and to diffuse useful and religious knowledge among the natives of Italy, and other papal countries.

The following are extracts taken from the most expressive parts of the Address:—

At the present day, the destinies of a large part of the human race are dependent on the condition of Italy. The empire which the Roman pontiff holds in the world of thought and faith, is in the most intimate alliance, offensive and defensive, with systems of secular misgovernment. An intellectual and moral revolution in Italy, emancipating the minds of the masses there, and establishing the great principle of religious freedom in the conviction of the people, would speedily be felt wherever the see of Rome has influence.

* * * * * *

The bishop of Rome, instead of being dishonored as the head of the worst governed state in Christendom, would become simply the chief dignitary of a great religious communion. That change would be felt throughout the world.

The common mind of Italy, it is believed, is gradually tending towards such a change. The abortive attempts at political revolution, which have occurred within the past twenty-five years, and which have been put down immediately by Austrian bayonets, have taught Italian patriotism one valuable lesson. The patriotic minds of that glorious land, whether in exile, or on their native soil, are understood to have abandoned the hope of liberating their country by insurrection and the sword. They see that there can be no hope of a new Italy, otherwise than by an intellectual and moral revolution that shall make the people new. They see that nothing desirable can be accomplished without the diffusion of new, quickening and elevating ideas among the masses of their countrymen.

* * * * * *

With such views, movements are already organized by Italians themselves to diffuse among their countrymen such knowledge as will tend to that intellectual and moral renovation without which all political changes will be of little value.

The Christian Alliance, for the promotion of religious freedom, has originated in the attention which gentlemen of various Christian denominations, in the city of New York and elsewhere, have recently given to the present condition of Italy, and the relations between that country and the cause of religious freedom throughout the world. A door is open for the access of truth to the minds of the Italian people. Notwithstanding the most rigid censorship over the press and the importation of books; notwithstanding every regulation which the genius of despotism can devise to shut out knowledge and to suppress inquiry; notwithstanding the terrors of Austrian artillery and the inconveniences of a police swarming in every quarter; it is ascertained that, to some extent, papers, tracts, books, the Bible itself, can be introduced into Italy, and can be placed in the hands of those who will hardly fail to read, and profit by the reading.

* * * * * *

With reference to the field thus opened among the Italians, both in and out of Italy, the "Philo-Italian Society" was founded a few months ago, in the city of New York. The correspondence of that society, and the consultations which it has held with friends of the cause in other parts of the country, have resulted in some modification and enlargement of the plan; and thus has arisen the organization which now presents itself to the Christian public. Our great object is the promotion of religious freedom; but still, as before, we propose to labor for that object, particularly and chiefly, by the diffusion of useful and religious knowledge among the Italians. It is upon Italy, with all its ancient and enduring influence upon the doctrines of the world, it is upon the metropolis of that great spiritual despotism which has for ages overshadowed the nations, that our eyes are fixed. Our prayer shall be, and our hope, that the great Babylon may fall; and that the banner of primitive Christian truth and freedom may float over the Vatican itself.

Appended to the Constitution and Address, is a statement of the *specific objects* of the *Alliance*. Among them are the following:—

1. It is proposed to send to London, Paris, Lyons, Switzerland, Marseilles, Corsica, Malta, Corfu, Constantinople, Smyrna, Alexandria, Algiers, Barcelona, and other parts of Europe resorted to by large bodies of Italians, a judicious agent to establish a correspondence, and depositories for the sale of Bibles and other books, and to effect other arrangements for the religious and intellectual improvement of that interesting people.

3. Funds are needed immediately for the preparation and publication of tracts and books in the Italian language; the History of the Reformation by Merle D'Aubigné should be translated into Italian without delay. The materials in McCrie's Memorials of the reformation in Italy may be put into an Italian dress, and published with great effect. The men are in this country, native Italians, men of taste, scholarship, patriotism, and enlightened piety, who may be employed on these and similar works.

Notwithstanding the cautious mode of expression, we think these extracts suffice to point out the *political* bearing of the *Alliance*. A few brief comments upon them will make it more evident.

By them, the sovereign pontiff is connected with "systems of secular misgovernment." An "intellectual and moral," not a religious, revolution is desired for Italy. An "emancipation of the minds of the masses" is sought for; a phrase which we know is always employed with reference to political objects and results. Again, the unhappy tendency, in what is called "Young Italy," to revolution and change, is alluded to; also "abortive attempts at political revolution." The *Alliance* proposes to accomplish and carry out that *movement* of the "common mind of Italy," not indeed by insurrection and the sword, but by means *more effectual* and within reach, the "*diffusion of new, quickening and elevating ideas.*"

Then allusion is made to the *movements already organized* among Italians. The assertion follows, that, "despite Austrian bayonets" and the "censorship over the press," Italians can be revolutionized. What does this language glance at, we would ask, if not to the adoption by the *Alliance* of measures in defiance of the local laws, and police regulations, of the Italian states? Nothing less than illegal measures and *book smuggling!* The extracts likewise refer to the Philo-Italian society of this city, to consultations with other *distant* friends of the cause, and to a common union of effort. Again, allusion is made to the establishing of *agencies* where expatriated Italians resort, in as immediate vicinity to Italy as possible: the keeping up of correspondences, which, if carried on at all, can only be *treasonable*, and in defiance of the Italian authorities. The Alliance proposes to co-operate with expatriated Italians and join with them in a common system of operations. This is most clearly evident!

It does not propose, by the ordinary means, to attempt the conversion of Italians by preaching, teaching, and distributing Bibles alone. It does not aim to change the belief alone, but the condition, of the masses. This the Alliance is to effect, not solely by the co-operation of Americans, nor by the union of religious sects, but by the aid of Italians, *absent* from the soil of their native land, wherever scattered—without reference to the religious views, or professions, of those expatriated specimens of Italian patriotism, and even without an inquiry whether they have any *religious* views at all.

In other words, the *Christian Alliance* has declared its *approval* of the schemes of Italian revolutionists and incendiaries; has established itself the associate and patron of political secret societies of Italian refugees; in fine, has become the friend and ally of "Young Italy."

We presume, in charity, that the respectable portion of the members of the *Alliance* are unacquainted with the very peculiar character of this "*Young Italy*," and of the pranks which she has been playing during the last few years.

We have already extended our remarks so far, that we must close here abruptly, with the promise of giving, at some future time, a sketch of the striking qualities of this youthful *favorite* of the CHRISTIAN ALLIANCE.—*Freeman's Journal.*

METROPOLITAN CATHOLIC ALMANAC, FOR 1846.—The reverend clergy, and all who feel an interest in the completeness and accuracy of the *Metropolitan Catholic Almanac and Laity's Directory*, are respectfully requested to forward to the editor of this Magazine, or to F. Lucas, jr., Baltimore, (before the 15th of next August,) such information as they may wish to appear in the above mentioned annual. As a special circular on this subject is addressed to the Rt. Rev. bishops, the present notice is intended particularly for those who, having the direction of colleges, academies, and religious communities, may desire to see a full and correct statement of their respective institutions, in the forthcoming Directory. To meet the wishes of the public, and to render the periodical as complete and interesting a source of information as possible, is the sole view of its conductors in thus requesting the co-operation of all who may contribute to its usefulness. The Catholic periodicals in the United States will confer a favor by publishing this notice once or twice.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—*Christ Healing the Sick*, and *The Spirit's Reproof*, poetical effusions, have been received, and will appear in September. We have also several publications on hand, the notice of which is deferred until our next.

History of the Life, Writings, and Doctrines of John Calvin, from the French of J. M. V. Audin, knight of the order of St. Gregory the Great, member of the academy and literary circle of Lyons, of the Tiberine academy, and of the academy of the Catholic religion, of Rome. Translated by Rev. John McGill. "Post tenebras spero lucem." Device of Catholic Geneva. Baltimore: John Murphy. Louisville: B. J. Webb & Brother.

This interesting volume, translated into English by the Rev. John McGill, is now offered to the public by the enterprising publishers in an elegant style both as regards printing and binding. But this part of the performance, though agreeable to the reader and pleasing to the author, is at best always but a secondary consideration. It is the subject, matter, and the manner in which it is handled, from which alone we can extract substantial profit. In this particular, the work before us will be found highly agreeable and instructive. To the reverend translator we tender our warmest acknowledgments for the gratification we have experienced in the perusal of a production which, but for his efforts, might have remained a sealed book to so many readers. He has carefully preserved the spirit of the original, and presented us in an English dress a work of the liveliest and most interesting character, and one which can not fail to delight wherever it is read. The style is so highly dramatic, and the incidents so vividly portrayed, that it is difficult to lay the work aside when once it is commenced. The industry and research which M. Audin has expended upon this literary labor are a sure guarantee of the fidelity and accuracy of its facts. To be satisfied of the diligence and caution with which he has collected the materials of his biography, we will let M. Audin speak for himself.

"We can affirm that for the composition of this work we have consulted more than a thousand volumes. We have given reference to these works in the progress of our history. The things that shall pass before your gaze are funeral realities; but another than ourselves shall write the recital of them. Now it shall be the secretary of the archives of the state council of the republic, and again Calvin himself. Did we narrate them ourselves, we should be accused of calumny. We have retrenched from this edition some facts in support of which we were not able to invoke the authority of the *reformed* writers. This we did because, above every thing, we desire to merit the eulogy of an impartial historian awarded to us publicly by one of our most learned professors, in one of his lectures in the college of France."

This praiseworthy caution led the author to submit his understanding of theological subtilties and delicate points of doctrinal difference, to reverend gentlemen distinguished for the soundness of their theological knowledge.

"Our first volume," says the author, "in all that trenches on dogmas, has been revised by a member of that celebrated Society of Jesuits which at Rome had so materially aided us in our historical researches. The second has been examined by a professor of theology. How much do we regret not being allowed here to mention the names of these two ecclesiastics; our readers would perceive what a pledge of correct information their aid offered to the historian."

A Compendium of Ancient and Modern History, with questions adapted to the use of schools and academies. Also an Appendix, containing the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, a Biographical Sketch of Eminent Personages; with a Chronological Table of remarkable events, discoveries, improvements, &c., from the creation to the year 1840. By M. J. Kerney. For sale by John Murphy.

We confess ourselves well pleased with this volume, and believe it is destined to find favor in the sphere for which the author has designed it. Its style is didactic and terse, and, while agreeable to the cultivated intellect, is adapted to the humblest comprehension. The title of the book is a fair exponent of its contents, all the leading facts of ancient and modern history being briefly presented to the reader. The author, as he promises in his preface, is very sparing in his own comments, though we could wish, judging from the few specimens he has given us, that he had dealt them out a little more liberally. One of these digressions, in his chapter entitled "Chivalry," is exactly after our mind.

"Whatever opinions we may entertain of chivalry at the present day, it certainly had a powerful influence in producing a favorable change in the manners of society during the ages in which it existed. It infused humanity into war at a period when men made it almost a business of life—it introduced courtesy of manners among those who possessed but little refinement—it fostered in its maxims a delicate sense of honor, and a scrupulous adherence to truth—it cherished the finest feelings and respectful attachment towards the female sex, and no institution, perhaps, ever had a more powerful influence to elevate woman to her proper sphere than chivalry."

There is one characteristic of the work, which pleases us above all others, and that is the studied care with which the author avoids all allusions and comments that might be in the slightest degree wounding to the religious sensibilities of members of any creed. This is a great desideratum in books designed for schools, as the evil of sectarianism so manifest in most of our elementary class-books has been long and loudly complained of. Nothing can be more improper in schools where children of all

denominations are mixed up than for tutors to use works of a sectarian character, or, what is worse, text books which are made up of calumnies and palpable falsehood insulting to the religious feelings of a portion of their pupils. We can not but hope that this work will be acceptable to our citizens, because of its fitness for the objects for which the author designed it, because of its impartial character, and because it is the production of a worthy and intelligent member of our own community.

The History of Ireland, by the Abbé McGeoghehan. Translated from the French, by Patrick O'Kelly, Esq. Published by Messrs. D. & J. Sadlier.

The third number of this excellent work has reached us, illustrated with a handsome frontispiece of Patrick Sarsfield, Earl of Lucan. This number, which is entirely engrossed with a narrative of Christian Ireland, is one of deep interest, and discourses of the palmiest days of Erin's glory; when the Emerald Isle abounded in saints preeminent in learning and piety, and its whole extent was regarded by admiring Europe as the focus of knowledge, and was visited by all Christendom on account of the facilities for finished education which it every where furnished. The Abbé, quoting from Cambden, an English historian, presents us his testimony in these words:

"Our Anglo-Saxons," says Cambden, "went in those times to Ireland, as if to a fair, to purchase knowledge: and we often find in our authors, that if a person were absent, it was generally said of him, by way of a proverb, that he was sent to Ireland for his education."—P. 204.

The New York "Truth Teller," speaking of Abbé McGeoghehan's work, pronounces it, before as well as since its translation, "a text book of Irish history," and commends it as one of the most accurate and reliable of Irish histories.

The Catholic Cabinet.

We hardly know that this is a fitting place to notice this periodical. The last columns of our Magazine are generally devoted to the introduction of new works to the public, whereas we are now about to take a reluctant farewell of an old one. We observed with great regret the closing notice of the publisher of the Catholic Cabinet to his subscribers, wherein he declares himself, "constrained by circumstances to discontinue" its issue. We have always recognised in his paper an able ally in the cause of truth, and could have wished it an endless existence. Our own experience, however, teaches us that the Catholic monthlies have at best a hard struggle to maintain themselves, and we do not wonder much when we hear of their discontinuance. We may, however, we trust, be permitted to hope that the able contributors to the St. Louis Cabinet will not entirely put aside their literary labors, but remember that there is a Catholic Magazine here, which will gratefully acknowledge any aid that they may be pleased to extend to it. By concentrating the talents of all Catholic sections of this country upon one point, we might hope ultimately to put one monthly at least upon a firm footing; and establish it permanently in these United States. How much better this than to see a number of monthly religious periodicals starting up, and each for want of sufficient encouragement dragging out a short and sickly existence. For the closing recommendation of the publisher in our behalf, we tender him our heartfelt thanks, and are truly glad to perceive that our efforts have found so much favor in a quarter where to receive praise is to feel some assurance that you have deserved it.

The Churchman's Faith and Practice. For sale by H. Colburn.

This work has been received by us, and we return our thanks to Mr. Colburn for his polite attention.

Oration, delivered before the Philodemic Society of Georgetown College, District of Columbia, July 5th, 1845. By Francis H. Dykers, of New York; to which are prefixed the Remarks of John W. Archer, of Virginia, previous to reading the Declaration of Independence.

We are gratified to observe the enthusiasm and unanimity with which our great national festival is celebrated among the colleges and institutions designed for the education of American youth. The force of early impressions is every where acknowledged, and we are glad to see them taking a right direction, so far at least as love of country and a proper estimate of our institutions are concerned. The oration before us, as well as the remarks preceding it, reflects equal credit on the intelligence and patriotism of pupils and instructors. Indeed, notwithstanding the misrepresentations and libels heaped upon that distinguished order, the Jesuits, by the deluded and the calumniator, we know of no association of men more pecularly fitted to finish young minds in classic and philosophic knowledge, and at the same time to imbue them with a proper appreciation of self, and of that position which, as members of a great republic, we are each and all entitled to. We always feel a particular interest in the remarks of young collegiate orators. Our mind is irresistibly led to contrast their relations to their auditors, with those of the wornout selfish demagogue. The one pours out the effusions of an untainted and disinterested patriotism, his young heart sincere and untempted in all its sentiments; the other, bending every thought to suit some vulgar prejudice, to laud alike what is evil and what is good in popular sentiment and action, always thinking more of self-promotion than the advancement of the true interests of his country.

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
3 8151 001 25064 3

LIBRARY
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
BRIGHTON